

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. LII

OCTOBER, 1954

NO. 1102

Decision on Segregation

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

*Reprinted from ETUDES**

WHEN the news was announced on May 17 that the Supreme Court of the United States had reached a unanimous decision declaring that racial segregation in the public (tax-supported) schools of the United States—challenged by petitioners from four States in the Union—is contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, there was no dancing in the streets of Harlem: that part of New York City which is the largest all-Negro urban settlement in the world. Far more excitement was evidenced at the time of Joe Louis' biggest victory. The attitude was rather—and paralleled by Negroes all over the country—one of immense relief: a generous "Thank God!"

After much uncertainty and much effort, after prolonged argument by some of the most eminent lawyers in the country, a conclusion had been reached which in point of fact was considerably better than all but the most hopeful had expected. Particularly gratifying was the fact that the decision was unanimous: the existence of one or two dissenting opinions would have seriously vitiated the force of the decision. But together with this sense of relief was the acute consciousness that the final victory—the abolition of racial segregation as a fixed policy in American education and American life in general—was still by no means won. Past experience had taught the Negroes that there still is a long struggle ahead.

As a Washington taxi driver expressed it: "You don't know what it means to be bound, then to be free. You ever take a chicken and tie his legs overnight? Then untie them in the morning. You know what he'll do? He won't move. You have to give him a push." Simple as was the issue and the decree itself, its implementation would be a long and difficult process. For this reason the Court wisely postponed to October of this year any argumentation as to "how" and "when" it expected its decision to be put into effect. As Chief Justice Earl Warren remarked, the formulation of decrees "presents problems of considerable complexity" because of the great variety of local conditions and other factors.

As was to be expected, much interest attached to the wording of the decree itself. For those who have studied discussions of the segregation question over the half-century, the line of reasoning followed was most instructive, since it reflects the course of U.S. history and the steady development of ideas: interesting for what it *was* and for what it *was not*. Asking itself and answering the decisive question, the Court declared:

Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other "tangible" factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does.

The Court then cited some of its

own previous findings, as well as the findings of other courts, in support of its position, and stated that "such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws." (Fourteenth Amendment)

LOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

Basically, these words of the decision represented simply the logical development of an idea implicit in the very founding of the American Republic. In the Declaration of Independence (1776) the Founding Fathers announced as "self evident" the principle that "all men are created equal." But they did not draw the obvious implication of this principle, namely, that therefore slavery should be abolished. On the contrary, they compromised on the slavery issue, and left the question whether all citizens, or only certain citizens, should enjoy equal status, to be settled differently by different regions of the country.

How wide a gap was still left was shown by the Dred Scott (fugitive slave) decision in 1857. After the slavery issue had been settled through the terrible arbitrament of a fratricidal civil war and President Lincoln's drastic Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1863, (ratified as the Thirteenth Amendment on December 18, 1865), the nation finally asserted the principle of universal equality by adopting on June 16, 1866 the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitu-

ion. This guarantees to all citizens "equal protection of the laws."

Although the Fourteenth Amendment was obviously intended to protect the civic rights of the recently emancipated Negroes, by a strange legal twist it was given an entirely different application, and was used to protect the rights of large business corporations against those attempting to bring suit against them. Once more the issue of full equality was left in suspense. It was challenged again in the historic case of *Plessy vs. Ferguson*, 1898, which concerned the barring of a Negro from a seat in a train coach reserved for white passengers. Yet even then the issue remained unresolved, for the majority of the court took refuge in the newly conceived and enunciated "separate but equal" doctrine. The court took refuge in the plea that where "facilities"—transportation, schools, etc.—were provided equally for both races, the mere fact of segregation did not imply any inequality. Dissenting was Justice John M. Harlan, who alleged in 1896 practically the same arguments that were used by the court in 1954.

From then on it took nearly half a century of argument, experience and decisive legal tests to create a climate of opinion in which could be

demonstrated with overwhelming force the deception lurking in the "separate-but-equal" doctrine.

A major factor of experience was progress in the economic and cultural status of the American Negroes themselves, who availed themselves with increasing enthusiasm of all educational opportunities, even when these opportunities carried with them the stigma of racial separation. Another factor was the growing consciousness among Negroes of the realities of their own situation, aided by their own national organizations, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (N.A.A.C.P.), which stressed the legal aspects of their problem; the National Urban League and its numerous local branches, concerned mainly with social adjustment and economic opportunity. In the field of higher, i.e., professional education, especially upon the graduate level, the principle of "separate but equal" was progressively demolished by a series of decisions issued by the Supreme Court in response to particular petitions. Further impetus was given to the clarification of the whole matter by the acutely unjust situation in the nation's capital itself.

At the same time, the climate of opinion was being prepared from an-

other quarter by the action of the various religious bodies, Jewish, Protestant and Catholic. The Catholic interracial movement, which was born formally, as it were, on Pentecost Sunday, 1934, has had a profound effect on Catholic opinion as such, and in no small degree upon the general attitude of the country, particularly when the principle of racial segregation was publicly disavowed by so many of the leading members of the Catholic hierarchy: Cardinal Spellman, Archbishops Ritter and Rummel, Bishops Waters, Ireton and others.

Finally, President Eisenhower himself had expressed himself strongly upon the idea on various occasions, and had committed himself definitely to a total abolition of the segregation principle in the District of Columbia itself. With his full approval, a strong nail was driven into the coffin of the separate-but-equal doctrine by the abolition of racial segregation in all three branches of the Armed Forces of the United States.

After all this preparation, much speculation was rife as to which of three possible courses the decision would take. The first would have been the course of strict legalism, in the spirit of the Dred Scott decision. In that unfortunate instance Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, of Maryland, himself a Catholic and a profoundly religious, personally humble man—who waited in line behind the Negro

parishioners when he went to confession—could not bring himself to see the human issue overriding the strictly legal picture of the Negro slave as a negotiable piece of commercial property. Although Justice Frankfurter, of the present Supreme Court, is professedly a liberal-minded jurist, there was some anxiety over Mr. Frankfurter's tendency to boggle at strictly legal technicalities.

On the other hand, the decision was not rendered upon the wide basis of high moral principles: the injustice or moral turpitude of segregation as an offence against the inherent dignity of the human person. Much had been said and written by moralists upon this topic; but for the argument to swing weight with the mass of the American public a more distinctively *ad hominem* reasoning was needed.

A SOCIOLOGICAL PREMISE

The court argued therefore directly from what may be termed a sociological premise, a deduction from an obvious fact, specific to the general social situation in the United States, or rather from two quite irreconcilable facts. (Indirectly or implicitly the argument bears upon the entire situation of the human person in the modern world.) These facts may be stated as, first, the nation's unreserved commitment to a comprehensive program of universal educational opportunity at the public expense,

open to all American youth without exception. This happens to be true especially in the thirteen States of the South where segregation laws are in force. The South ranks far below the other regions of the United States in terms of per capita income. But as a recent report of the Ford Foundation points out, it ranks well above most of the rest of the country in terms of the proportion of its income it has been spending for the education of its children in public schools. From 1940 to 1953 expenditures per pupil in Southern schools increased more than fourfold.

Some of this acceleration may be ascribed to the recent revolutionary changes in the economic life of the country and the corresponding influx of people from other regions. Southern agriculture has changed in many instances from a tobacco or cotton monoculture to cattle-raising and diversified farming, and northern industrial plants have been moving in large numbers to the South (not always, be it noted parenthetically, with the most happy economic results).

While in many instances gross inequalities still exist between the educational facilities provided for the two races, white and black, theoretically the facilities are equal, and in point of fact in many other localities such equality is *de facto* realized. It is easy when traveling through the Southern States to see primary and

secondary Negro schools that would surpass the fondest dreams of white children a short generation ago; and generous provision is made in many cases for the Negro institutions of higher learning, both state-supported and privately owned.

STIGMA OF INFERIORITY

The other obvious sociological fact lies in the psychological order. It is that compulsory segregation cannot be in any way reconciled with the sacred dogma of universal and equal opportunity. The mere fact of compulsory separation lays an evident stigma of inferiority upon the human person, with a consequent trauma of the personality itself, particularly in a rapidly advancing and expanding democratic culture such as that of the United States. As expressed by the Court, citing a finding by another court, which nevertheless felt constrained to rule against the Negro plaintiffs:

Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group.

A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system.

This finding, they note, is "amply supported by modern authority," which they refer to in an appendix. Among those cited is the monumental research work of Gunnar Myrdal, *The American Dilemma*, who foresaw such a contradiction as operating in accordance with inevitable dialectic.

The reasoning of the Court, therefore, turns not so much upon the wrongness *per se* of an implicitly inferior status, but upon the total impossibility of reconciling such a practice with the professed public social policy of the country.

ATTITUDE OF NEGRO TEACHERS

In answer to this argument, utterances are sometimes quoted of Negroes and especially Negro teachers who express themselves as satisfied with their supposedly separate-but-equal status. Such voices, however, are definitely in the minority among the younger and more progressive members of the race, and absent, too, to a surprising extent even among the older generation. Many of the older folk are cautious in expressing themselves to strangers, but their attitude is shown in quite pragmatic fashion by the widespread monetary contributions which, with but little persuasion, the masses of the colored people have made towards the expenses of the litigation.

Moreover, the claim that large numbers of teachers and other em-

ployees in the present segregated institutions will be thrown out of their positions is seen on closer examination to be largely groundless, since *de facto* the decree is not expected to make any radical change in the status of the existing separate institutions. Most of these will continue voluntarily separated institutions pretty much as before for a long time to come. The immediate and drastic change is the removal of the element of compulsion.

As for the sociological fact just referred to—the presence of this sense of frustration as the result of being compelled to submit to a rigidly enforced separate status—it is clear from long and expert sociological observation and the corresponding documentation, to which the Court refers in an appendix. Would space permit, I could add to this documentation from my own personal experiences and observation. Observers particularly note that the deleterious effects of a prevailing policy of segregation are also felt by those of the majority group in whose favor such legislation is enforced.

The immediate legal effect of the decision is to make it possible for future complainants to obtain fair judicial decisions—if not in lesser courts, at least in the Supreme Court—since the courts can no longer take refuge in the separate-but-equal doctrine.

At the time of writing, such a con-

plaint is already pending. It was brought by a Negro who has been refused admission to a State-supported institution since the issuance of the decree. The principle involved in the decision will also apply—under many modalities—to other areas where racial discrimination may be practised, such as transportation, eating, recreational and hotel facilities, employment, etc., and Negro leaders have already announced that they now expect to drive for the end of discrimination in the field of residence and of employment. It will undoubtedly be used also to determine the status of other racial or national origin minorities, such as the American Indians in local communities, Orientals, or the recently arrived Puerto Ricans.

REACTION TO THE DECISION

What, then, the reader will naturally ask, will be the reaction to this unusual and far-reaching judicial decision, especially in the regions where it directly conflicts with existing custom and time-honored legislation? Will it be met by violent and stubborn resistance; or will policies be peacefully changed? To this query a somewhat complex answer is in order.

Several of the States have announced that they had no intention of complying with the decree. Yet, apart from the fully anticipated and explosive protestations of certain political figures, such as Governors

Herman Talmadge of Georgia and James F. Byrnes of South Carolina, the reaction has been relatively mild. Significant was the circumstance that only a few governors responded to an invitation sent to the governors of all the "segregation" States to consider ways and means of defeating the decision. The others declared themselves interested only in finding ways by which to meet peacefully the problems created by the inevitable changes that must take place in the relations of the races.

Among a considerable number of the more progressive, less culturally isolated people of the South, the sentiment prevails that such a change is bound to come anyway, whether welcome or unwelcome, and that it is just as well that the matter has been judicially settled once and for all. As in so many other instances, politicians are obliged to continue loud professions of certain likes and dislikes, in order to retain the popular vote. When those mistaken attitudes have been overcome by wider information of the public at large, the politicians are glad to follow suit.

As usual the negative and the wrong-headed minority first gain the public ear. My own personal observation of southern communities over the years has convinced me that many more white Southerners than is commonly suspected are anxious, especially among the younger generation, to free themselves from the harsh

bonds of racial prejudice but are as yet timid and uncertain about making their voices heard.

Where white Southern Catholics entertain strong convictions on this point, it is particularly difficult for them to make themselves heard, since they are as yet but a small minority among an overwhelming and powerful Protestant majority. All the more credit, therefore, to the groups of Catholics in some of the Southern States who have united to express their belief in according complete opportunity to all citizens, regardless of race, both in the civic and in the religious community. They have been encouraged by the uniformly enthusiastic reception which the Catholic press of the country has given to the decision.

DELAYING TACTICS

On the legal side, delaying tactics will undoubtedly be put into effect in many legislatures of the Southern States, proposing that nothing be done about the situation for two, three or five years. How effective these will be is still problematical. Yet I cannot feel that such action is of very great significance. The effect of the decision is practically irresistible *per se*, such is the position of the Supreme Court as one of the three equal and coordinate branches of the U.S. Government and such is the irresistible trend of the times. In fact, such delaying tactics may in

some ways be good; they may relieve immediate tensions, and in the long run enable communities to reach a more solid basis of social peace.

Extremists on the side of reaction are matched by extremists from the opposite direction, who would wish to use the decision in order to taunt and provoke the reluctant southern elements to the point of frenzy. Outside of a small minority among the Negroes, and some of the notorious Communist-inspired groups in the country, such a disposition seems notably absent from the great mass of the Negro people as such. Indeed, the first utterance of outstanding Negro leaders immediately after the decision was emphatically to counsel moderation and patience, to refrain from gloating and provocative demonstrations, and particularly to advocate settlement of the problems at strictly local levels.

Nation-wide publicity was given to the meeting held at Atlanta, Georgia, under the auspices of the N.A.A.C.P. and in the very teeth of Georgia's fire-eating Governor Talmadge, and the moderation and dignity of its pronouncements. Said in noble words the venerable Dr. Channing H. Tobias, chairman of the N.A.A.C.P. board and a former member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations:

Let it not be said of us that we took advantage of a sweeping victory to drive hard bargains or impose unnecessary hardship upon those responsible

for working out the details of adjustment. It is important that calm reasonableness prevail, that the difficulties of adjustment be realized and that without any sacrifice of basic principles the spirit of give-and-take characterize the discussions.

The *really* decisive and history-making *sequelae* of the May 17 decision will not be loud noises and headline-making dramatic stances. History will be shaped during these ensuing years and the foundations of a newer and better order for the United States laid in quiet discussion and peaceful though frank deliberations of countless local communities. People of different races and origins will need to work out their interpersonal solutions cooperatively, not for the advantage of this group or the other, but for the common good of all. The announcement by the Supreme Court coincides more or less with marked increase all over the United States of such self-directing cooperative deliberation on local problems, in the educational, recreational, economic and civic-rights field. This impetus, already begun, will undoubtedly receive much greater stimulus from the new challenge presented to the citizens themselves.

THE MORAL ARGUMENT

As I said, the wider and deeper strictly moral argument against segregation, aided by purely religious considerations, did not enter explicitly into the decision of May 17, though

it was undoubtedly implicit in the very notion of requiring at all costs, even of great personal inconvenience, a conduct consistent with professed national ideals. But this higher line of argument will find free play in the months and years to come. It is in these debates, on the local or national level, that the higher, truly spiritual considerations must undoubtedly play a major part. This is already evidenced by the many utterances on behalf of interracial justice and equality that have come, since the decision was rendered, from many church sources, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, and the chorus will increase. It will show itself particularly in the personal leadership offered by religious persons of all faiths in stimulating a cooperative approach to the practical problems of integration on the local level.

It is significant that the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States announced on June 3 that they had decided to shift the site chosen for their triennial convention because the city originally chosen, Houston, Texas, was unable to house and entertain their delegates properly owing to existing segregation policies.

One of the strongest aids to such an approach is the store of information already acquired as to the practical workings of integration where it has been put into practice. Such arguments drawn from experience

are more effective than a multitude of purely theoretical considerations. Several reports in particular have done much to still anxious questioning as to "what would happen" if Negro children sit side by side with white children in the same classroom or play together in the same school yards. One of these is the magnificent report on integration in the Armed Forces, entitled *Breakdown on the Color Front*, by Lee Nichols (Random House, New York. \$3.50). Another is the rigidly factual and solidly documented *The Negro and the Schools*, by Harry Ashmore (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C. \$2.75). This presents the recent findings of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, which organized a team of forty-five American scholars to investigate every aspect of the subject, and to make a broad appraisal for the future. (The report on Catholic schools was drawn up by Professor John J. O'Connor, of Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. and is described in *Interracial Review* for April, 1954.)

Dry as are figures by nature, in this case, in the author's words, "the figures tell the story," the fact that, as Ralph McGill, the editor of the influential *Atlanta Constitution*, wrote: "Segregation has been on its way out for a good long time and has been breaking down at the edge for more than a generation," yielding to both secular and religious forces.

But on the other hand, as Mr. Ashmore points out, "there is the hard fact that integration in a meaningful sense cannot be achieved by the mere physical presence of children of two races in a single classroom. No public school is isolated from the community that supports it. The discussion between the races today, he notes, is no longer between white and Negro college presidents, but between the parents of Negro children and the white laymen who sit on local school boards. "It is here that the South will have to determine the future of its educational system. . . . The new patterns will have to be hammered out across the table in thousands of scattered school districts, and they will have to be shaped to accommodate not only the needs but the prejudices of those whites and Negroes to whom these problems are not abstractions but the essence of their daily lives." And he ends with the comprehensive words:

In the long sweep of history the public school cases before the Supreme Court may be written down as the point at which the South cleared the last turning in the road to reunion—the point at which finally, and under protest, the region gave up its peculiar institutions and accepted the prevailing standards of the nation at large as the legal basis for its relationship with its minority race. This would not in itself bring about any great shift in Southern attitudes, nor even any far-reaching immediate changes in the pattern of bi-racial education. But it would re-define the goal the Southern people, white and

Negro, are committed to seek in the way of democracy.

Many a reader in other lands is apt to feel impatient with our elaborate and complicated methods of reaching a conclusion which seems to people of other nations as a foregone matter of simple justice and equity. Yet, as I have on various occasions said before, it is this very difficulty and circuitousness of approach which in the long run produces fruits of inestimably precious experience: precious not for the American community alone, but for the co-existence of different peoples in the world.

The American advances in the field of interracial justice may be a bit slow, but they are not as slow as they seem from abroad; for anyone who knows our conditions they are surprisingly rapid; and above all, they are permanent; of permanent value not for ourselves alone but for all future time and the entire future human race. Through these very disagreements and the valiant efforts at overcoming them a lasting sense of a common good is forged, one that will in the end not be easily shaken through passing emotions. No lesson, outside of sheer self-defense against aggression and the march of totalitarian tyranny, is more necessary for the free world today. None will be more necessary for the entire world, if the present demon of world division is bound and cast into the sea.

Let me then sum up these reflec-

tions by a few words of a purely personal nature. First, along with the great majority of Americans of every race, I experience a deep sense of relief and of gratitude to divine Providence for what I firmly believe is a most timely decision. Secondly, I feel a gratitude for the way in which it was offered, and gratitude also for the relatively peaceful reception it has had. But the feelings are mingled with an equally deep sense that the task as yet is only begun. A false solution has been removed, but the real philosophy of co-existence must be worked out, and mountains of prejudice are still to be moved.

Herein I see particularly a ringing challenge for the Church in the United States to amplify and perfect the witness to integrity and charity which, thank God, it has already given. We have the opportunity; it is ours to use it. But in this we need the sympathy and encouragement of our fellow Catholics all over the world, as we, in turn, offer our own sympathy and encouragement to people of many religious faiths who are engaged in a similar task here at home. I expect to see times of great stress and strain ahead; many disagreements and even angry recriminations. But the "goal has been set," and the means for marching toward that goal. It is none else than a truly human life for man as God made him, for a truly Christian life for man as Christ redeemed him.

Papal Teaching Authority

MOST REV. JOHN J. WRIGHT

Bishop of Worcester

*Reprinted from THE VOICE OF ST. JUDE**

DURING his luminous pontificate Pope Pius has made frequent use of radio broadcasts to the world, to particular nations and to national or international Eucharistic and other congresses. In addition to such radio talks, he has delivered many public addresses to general or representative special groups such as doctors, lawyers, scientists, working-men and associations or societies of peoples banded together by interest in a particular idea or program.

Sometimes the question arises: are these talks intended for the faithful all over the world? Do they impose on Catholics the obligation to accept the statements made in them, or are we free to reject any public statement of the Pope so speaking when these are at variance with our own views?

The answer to these questions is clear and important. Let us note that we are here limiting ourselves to the binding force of teaching contained in radio addresses and public addresses. The assent expected of Ca-

tholics to solemn definitions, the so-called *ex cathedra* pronouncements, has always been beyond discussion: the *Humani Generis* has reaffirmed and clarified the Catholic teaching on the assent to be given encyclical letters.

The answers to the further questions currently posed are based on the following truths:

1. It is the Roman Pontiff who is speaking in these radio broadcasts and public addresses. To be sure, the Roman Pontiff may, if he so wills, speak as a private person and a private theologian. But it is hardly likely that he is speaking thus privately and, so to say, "off the record," when he is deliberately speaking in radio broadcasts and public addresses on matters of great urgency and universal concern. Even though the group addressed be limited, such addresses are clearly intended for the whole Church inasmuch as afterwards, at the Pope's direction, they are published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* and are thus communicated to the

whole Church. This fact constitutes a norm for judging and acting according to the mind of the Church.

2. Although the Roman Pontiff always has the plenitude of teaching authority, and undoubtedly uses it in his radio broadcasts and public addresses when he treats of faith and morals in them, nevertheless on these occasions he does not use it in its full and supreme degree. For this reason, radio broadcasts and public addresses are not numbered among "infallible pronouncements." They are made not *ex cathedra* but under the ordinary teaching authority of the Pope.

3. While radio broadcasts and public addresses by the Pope cannot be put in the same class as his encyclical letters, still they are usually comparable to them in that they are utterances of the supreme teacher and pastor of Christendom, using his teaching office to teach and guide the Christian flock in matters of faith and morals. Accordingly, the truly faithful will accord the Holy Father on such occasions that internal and external compliance which, according to Catholic teaching, is due the teaching authority of the Church in its ordinary exercise.

4. The assent which we give to this authority in its ordinary exercise is known technically as "religious assent." It is a true internal assent. Its motive is not the authority of God speaking, nor is it precisely the in-

fallibility of the Church's teaching authority, but rather the official position of the Supreme Teacher.

"HE WHO HEARS YOU HEARS ME"

The certitude in "religious assent" can perhaps be compared to *practical* certitude, the certitude we use so much in daily living. For example, reason cannot exclude all danger of accident every time we board a bus, a train or a plane. Yet the danger of accident is sufficiently excluded to warrant a prudent man's traveling. Practical certitude does not absolutely exclude the possibility of error, because its motive is not infallible, but its assent can be practically as firm as if all possibility of error were excluded. Such assent involves an extension of the virtue of faith, inasmuch as Christ's words, "He who hears you hears me," also apply to the Pope's ordinary public teaching.

So the original question perhaps should be worded: "are the radio broadcasts and public addresses of the Pope directed to the faithful all over the world?" The answer is yes, certainly, once the talk is included in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. The answer to the question: "Do these talks impose on Catholics the obligation to accept the statements made in them or are Catholics free to reject statements which are at variance with their own opinion?" is: These statements are to be accepted with religious assent.

A practical illustration may help to clarify the answers given above. The first encyclical letter which Pius XII issued was the *Summi Pontificatus*. Writing on the unity of human society, he cited two errors which he said blighted the hope for peaceful co-operation among nations. The first error was the forgetfulness of the law of human solidarity and charity; the second was the divorce of civil authority from dependence on the Supreme Being.

HUMAN SOLIDARITY

Pope Pius set forth the law of human solidarity both from reason (the equality of men on the score of origin, nature and destiny) and revelation (solidarity with Adam and solidarity with Christ, involving the universality of original sin and universality of the Redemption of Christ). Repeatedly during the recent war and in the postwar years up to our own day, the Holy Father has returned to the theme of peace and of the importance of an acknowledgement, practical as well as theoretical, of the law of human solidarity. He has stressed in public addresses the importance, even the necessity, of an international organization to achieve the social implications of that solidarity. In a public address to the members of an international confer-

ence of "The Universal Movement for a World Confederation," the Pope mentioned his abiding interest in the cause of peace and stressed the unremitting efforts of the Church to help build a peaceful order.

In that address the Holy Father said: "Your movement, gentlemen, strives to make real an efficacious political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the Church, nothing is more adapted to its teaching on just and unjust war, especially in the present circumstances." The Holy Father then indicated certain fundamental principles in the national and constitutional realm, in the domain of economics and social affairs, as well as in the field of culture and morals that must be established or restored. There are many other addresses in recent years on the same general theme.

No Catholic is free to say that such statements as these do not receive his "religious assent."

The fact that occasionally some Catholics may quibble about or even contradict what the Holy Father has to say in his apostolic efforts to provide the world with moral leadership is sad, even scandalous, but it signifies nothing about the binding force of such public pronouncements by the Pope.

British Socialism

R. P. WALSH

*Reprinted from CHRISTUS REX**

IT IS probable that the British Labor Party will once again be the government of Great Britain after the next general election. That probability is by no means a certainty and the open warfare that is taking place between leading members of the Party may well reduce its chances. On the other hand as an election draws near the differences will sink below the surface and as public feeling so often reacts against the government in office, Labor's own troubles may hurt them far less than the gains from the Conservative Government's difficulties help.

The British Labor Party is a Socialist party and to Catholic ears there is so much in that word that has an unpleasant sound that the natural instinct of many is to oppose such a party. As against the historical meaning of that word is the undoubted fact that a vast proportion of British Catholics support the Labor Party and that Catholics are to be found in every level from ordinary members to members of the shadow cabinet.

To read the history of the Labor Party or to meet the rank-and-file

members, especially in the Mersey and Clyde areas, is to meet a considerable number of Irish names, and the Party over the past fifty years has grown strong in those areas on the Irish vote.

All these factors—the Catholic and in particular Irish support of the Party and the open Socialism of its program—do demand that an attempt be made to examine the Party and see what is the position of Catholics within it. The present position is simple: in 1918 Cardinal Bourne made it clear that Catholics were free to join the Labor Party, and in more recent years Cardinal Griffin has made it clear that nothing that the Labor Government did from 1945 onwards was contrary to Catholic doctrine.

True there are Catholics who equate "Socialism" (even in its British form) with "Communism" and express amazement that any Catholic can join the Labor Party. When a Catholic stands as a Labor candidate, he has to expect such statements and there is no doubt that they influence some of the middle-class Catholics who might, without

* Main St., Nass, Eire, July, 1953

this propaganda, have voted for the Catholic candidate.

Such propaganda takes no account of the British Hierarchy and deserves to be dismissed with the contempt due for those Catholic laymen who wish to be more Catholic than their bishops.

Thus the present situation has no difficulties. But what of the future?

THE LEFT-WING

At Morecambe, the Lancashire seaside resort, Labor met at the beginning of October, 1953, for its annual conference and from the beginning of the week headlines flashed round the world telling of the victory of the left-wing of the Party. Delegate after delegate demanded more nationalization and opposed the official view of the need to consolidate. There was considerable talk about the "Socialist" foreign policy and "Socialist" view of industry.

Such a noisy element has always existed inside the Labor Party, which definitely has a Marxist wing. The difference this year was that the people this section supported in the elections for the Party Executive had a sensational victory. For a long time to come there will be arguments as to the exact meaning of this vote and time alone will tell what difference it will make to the Labor Party.

A few points need to be made. First of all the election was less a victory for "Socialism" than a de-

feat of a heavy armament policy. This victory was secured with the help of the pacifists (who are obviously non-Marxists) and of a moderate group apprehensive of the effect of re-armament on the social services. Secondly, it was a vote for popular personalities known to the rank and file. So many of the members of the Executive are so seldom in the public eye that the rank and file knows nothing about them, while the Bevanite group have travelled the country speaking to local parties and have secured a personal following and a reputation for being a ginger group.

Will the left-wing victory change the Party policy? That entails a measure of prophecy that the present writer does not have. It could result in speeding up the party program and canceling the idea of going slow for a time. Thus it could mean that nationalization projects will be included in the next election program. It could also mean that the Morrison doctrine of justification of each act of nationalization may give way to nationalization for nationalization's sake. Obviously such a change would place Catholic members of the Party in a difficult position.

That is the bad element in the present situation. The danger does exist and the more vocal the very left of the Party is, the greater is that danger. But there is a more hopeful aspect.

The basis of the more hopeful aspect was clear at the Morecambe conference. First, there was the considerable number of members of Parliament who were moderates—and even right-wing (if you can imagine that term describing any member of the Labor Party); secondly, there was the opposition to nationalization proposals from the very trade unions who would be affected; thirdly, there was the very practical approach by such leaders as Mr. Attlee and Mr. Morrison (who will probably remain deputy leader of the Party in spite of attempts by the Bevanites to displace him).

These M.P.'s were far less concerned with theory and "hot-air" than with the stark realities of the present world situation. They did not support armaments for their own sake but because of the fear of Russia.

This realism was supported by the Parliamentary leaders, who emphasized that whatever ministers controlled affairs, and whatever their ideas were, there were certain problems that had to be given priority—balance of trade, monetary questions and above all food—and very little time was left for the theories. The trade-union leaders do not love nationalization as much as they once did, and in any case think that full employment and the reduction of the cost of living are far more important for their members.

These three sections and not the

Bevanites will control the next Labor Government. The trade unions control the Labor Party executive and have twenty-one moderates to the six members who are of the Bevan group. The M.P.'s control the Parliamentary Labor Party where the Bevanites are in a small minority. Mr. Attlee and his friends will determine the composition of the next Labor Government.

If these points are considered, the Bevanite victory is placed against its proper background and a better sense of proportion prevails. The conclusion has to be that the moderate section of the Party still dominates and that no Catholic need have immediate fear.

NATIONALIZATION

This does not mean that there will be no nationalization. It only means that nationalization will be preceded by evidence that it is necessary. While one can be sure that such evidence will not convince some, yet others will find in it factors that will enable them, from their Catholic principles, to justify it.

One great demand will be for nationalization of the armament industry and this, it might be recalled, is one industry that *Osservatore Romano* held could justly be nationalized.

The other major demand may well be on water supplies. This is just an aspect of the great food problem.

For many reasons connected with the world situation and the dollar problem Britain must increase the proportion of home-grown food from one-half to two-thirds of the total food consumption. Since 1945 there have been great advances but still more has to be done if Britain is not to go hungry. Many things stand in the way and some of them can only be tackled by Government action. One is the provision of water in rural areas. Some local authorities have been so backward that it is now impossible financially for them to make good all the years of neglect. But if those wasted years are not made good quickly, Britain may well go hungry.

Further, there is no doubt that Britain must adapt herself to new world conditions. Britain's industry was built up when Britain was the workshop of the world and the world no longer wants such a workshop. Each country is anxious to develop its own resources and to reduce its dependence on other countries. Thus parts of British industry need to be scrapped. British workers need to learn new techniques and perhaps to live in new areas. The land must receive a vast influx of labor and capital. These things can only be achieved by design and cannot be left to chance. Such central planning will have to be carried out by any government unless Britain is to break down within twenty-five years.

In the nature of things such neces-

sities carry with them dangers to liberty and to the essential rights of individuals and of families. No one has indicated how such changes can be avoided and the problem is to carry them out with the minimum damage to fundamental rights.

CHRISTIAN OPPORTUNITY

A problem of this kind suggests a Christian opportunity. Already there are two signs that this is so. One is the flow of books and pamphlets from Labor Party leaders that are based, knowingly or otherwise, on a Christian conception and that are, to a greater or less degree, in conformity with papal documents on social questions. There are a number of these—naturally of different values—but all hopeful of the future. The second sign is the growth of a Catholic group in the Party.

In the past Catholics have played an important part in minor roles. Too many of these Catholics had no training in the social doctrines of the Church and never realized that there is a relationship between their faith and their politics. Of some it could be said that they were Labor Party people who happened to be Catholics. Today there is a growing group of Catholics who happen to be Laborites, who know the social teaching of the Church and whose acceptance of certain political dogmas has been dependent on their conclusion that those dogmas could be readily recon-

ciled with the principles taught by the Church.

These two signs give us reason for hope. The danger is that the moderate rank and file will be too apathetic to support those leaders who

represent the non-Marxist section of the Party. If they were supported as the Bevanites are supported by their followers, there would be no danger for the future. The question is whether such support will be given.



Gimmicks and Vocations

We are glad Bishop Wright of Worcester spoke out to Catholic educators against the silly nonsense that is being perpetrated in the cause of fostering religious vocations.

"Throw out the gimmicks," the Bishop told them. The pious style shows and the enthusiastic descriptions of handball games in the seminary are worse than a waste of time as far as vocations go. "Amen, Bishop," say we.

Tell them it's going to be tough. Tough enough to get through the preparation and tougher thereafter. That is not only more accurate but also more effective. Any priest or nun in his or her right mind can remember that what attracted them to their state of life was certainly not some trivial material advantage.

No girl ever stayed six months in a convent because she wanted to wear that "cute" religious habit. No boy ever studied in a seminary for the wonderful ball games played there. You can get far snappier clothes and better baseball outside the convent or seminary.

Why do vocation directors see fit to waste time over-selling the meager material benefits that a religious vocation entails? To be honest they don't amount to much, even in adult eyes. To over-confident youngsters they aren't a patch on what the kids think they could wrest from life in the business world.

What attracts and fosters vocations now as before is idealism. The idea of sacrificing the perishable pleasures of the world for something of far higher value. It's idealism that fires boys and girls with the desire to be selfless persons dedicated to Christ and to the spiritual welfare of their neighbors.

This kind of idealism is not fostered one bit by telling the youngsters how secure and carefree their life in a convent or monastery will be. The youngsters don't want to be carefree. That's an adult dream. When you were young, remember, you wanted to bear the responsibilities of the whole world.

Kids dream of being President of the United States; only adults ever dream of being Vice-President.—*INDIANA CATHOLIC AND RECORD, Indianapolis, Ind.*, April 30, 1954.

Literature For Convert-Makers

REV. JOHN A. O'BRIEN, Ph.D.

University of Notre Dame

*Reprinted from ST. JOSEPH MAGAZINE**

“WE'RE surrendering," said the officer of a German battalion to a colonel in General Patton's army, "but in doing so we don't acknowledge you Americans to be better soldiers or gamier fighters than we. You have more and better arms. That's the factor that has tipped the scales in your favor."

That acknowledgment of the tremendous advantage possessed by the side with the better weapons holds true not only in physical combat but also in spiritual warfare. The Christian has formidable foes in the world, the flesh and the devil, and he must equip himself with the superior weapons of the spirit if he hopes to gain the victory.

All those seeking to bring the saving truths of Christ to the churchless millions of America are facing the formidable foes of secularistic materialism, religious indifferentism and a thinly-veined paganism. They must have superior weapons to gain the victory over such strong and entrenched adversaries. The effective weapons for them are prayer, pen-

ance and carefully prepared literature.

In visiting the ancient Benedictine establishment which clusters like a little monastic town from the medieval past about Durham Cathedral in England, our gaze was arrested by the inscription over the library: *Non minima pars educationis est cognoscere libros bonos*—To know good books is no small part of an education. It brought to our mind the words of Carlyle: "The true university today is a collection of great books."

Yes, great books embody the best thought and wisdom of the choice minds of all ages. "A good book," observes Milton, "is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a Life beyond life." The best and most important books are those which minister to the needs of the spirit, which serve as torches to light the way to one's eternal destiny with the God who made him.

The recruiter of souls for Christ should familiarize himself with books

* St. Benedict, Ore., July, 1954

which explain the teachings of Christ and His Church. They must become for him a second Bible. Even if one does not have a very extensive formal education, he can become an effective campaigner for Christ if he will master the contents of a dozen good books explaining his holy religion. He will make such books render double service if, after reading them, he will lend them to non-Catholic friends.

We talked with lay lecturers for the Catholic Evidence Guild in London and found that the vast majority of them are young men and women who never attended a college or university but who prepared themselves for their expositional role by reading and studying a dozen standard works on the Catholic religion. They were clerks, stenographers, artisans and accountants who knew how to put in the popular language that would appeal to their hearers the contents of such volumes.

It is surprising to discover the extent of the ignorance of religion that prevails among the masses. The person who has absorbed the contents of a handful of books can provide the churchless masses with the knowledge necessary to embrace the faith.

BOOKS EXPLAINING THE CATHOLIC FAITH

The following is an annotated list of a dozen books on the Catholic religion which have proved of maxi-

mum help to Catholics and to non-Catholic inquirers. They should be not only in the library of every priest but also in every Catholic home. They will prove especially useful for lay workers in the convert apostolate, whose numbers must be multiplied if we are to win the churchless millions of America for Christ.

Father Smith Instructs Jackson. A simple, popular exposition of the Catholic Faith which has helped many inquirers find their way into the true Church.

What's the Truth about Catholics? A presentation in conversational form of the Catholic religion, with charts and illustrations. Designed for Catholics and non-Catholics, it is widely used for convert instruction.

The Faith of Millions. A complete exposition of the credentials, teachings and practices of the Catholic religion, designed for those having at least a high-school education or its equivalent. Recently revised and equipped with numerous charts.

The Faith of Our Fathers. A popular explanation of the Catholic religion, designed especially for Bible-reading non-Catholics.

Rebuilding a Lost Faith. A convert writes beautifully of some of the basic truths of the Catholic religion.

I Believe. A short and very simple exposition of the fundamentals of the faith.

The Question Box. The answers to questions most commonly asked by

non-Catholics. A classic for years, recently revised.

Externals of the Catholic Church. An explanation of the chief sacramentals of the Church, designed to supplement an explanation of the doctrines of the Church.

The Belief of Catholics. A scholarly exposition of the chief doctrines of the Church by a British convert priest.

The Spirit of Catholicism. A carefully reasoned exposition of the spirit of the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, by a German theologian.

Truths Men Live By. Establishes the basic philosophical truths of the Catholic religion by appeal to philosophy, science and history. Designed for both Catholics and non-Catholics.

Theology and Sanity. A presentation of the basic dogmas of Catholic theology, designed for the more advanced reader.

BOOKS ON CONVERT-MAKING

To be an effective salesman of Christ's truths it is not sufficient merely to understand the Catholic religion. It is necessary to know the best methods of presenting those truths to people who are indifferent and to those who are hostile. There have been worked out in the convert field, as well as in the business domain, various techniques which embody the thought and experience of the most successful salesmen.

It is important for every worker in this difficult field to familiarize himself with those techniques so he will not be obliged to learn by the painful and costly method of trial and error. Surely the salesman of divine truth should not be less eager than the salesman of earthly commodities to press into service the technique which will enable him to do the most effective job for His divine Master. "Carefully study," writes St. Paul from his prison in Rome to his faithful disciple Timothy, "to present thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly handling the word of truth."

There is one place where careless, slipshod methods are singularly out of place, and that is in the service of God. On the walls of an old monastery at San Angel, a short distance outside of Mexico City, are inscribed the words of the prophet Jeremias: *Maledictus qui facit opus Dei negligenter.* "Cursed be he who does the work of God negligently." Well might those words be written deep in the mind and memory of every worker in the convert apostolate.

The following books embody the ripe thought and experience of successful and outstanding convert-makers, clerical and lay. They will greatly increase the effectiveness of every laborer in the convert field.

The White Harvest. (Newman Company, Westminster, Maryland.) The first symposium ever published

on methods of winning converts. Eleven noted experts detail the techniques which, with God's grace, enabled them to reap an abundant harvest of souls. A pioneer study that brought a special letter of commendation from Pope Pius XI and that remains a classic in this field.

Winning Converts (P. J. Kennedy and Sons, New York.) This symposium endeavors to reflect the new trends and the significant developments in the techniques of recruiting and of instructing converts which took place in the twenty-year period since the publication of *The White Harvest*. Eighteen leaders in this field describe in detail the type of publicity used to attract prospects to their Inquiry Classes and explain their methods of presenting Catholic truth.

Sharing the Faith. (Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Indiana.) This symposium mirrors the increased activity in the convert apostolate, the participation of more laity in the movement, and details methods of appealing to different classes of prospects with a view of recruiting them for attendance at Inquiry Classes. Twenty-eight experts discuss every phase of the convert apostolate, ranging from the use of the pulpit dialogue to the methods of inducing the non-Catholic partner in a mixed courtship to take the complete course of instruction before marriage.

Techniques for Convert-Makers. Edited by Rev. John T. McGinn, C.S.P. (Paulist Press, 401 W. 59th Street, New York.) This is a monthly release, usually six large pages featuring an article that bears directly or indirectly upon some phase of the convert apostolate. It keeps workers in the convert field up-to-date with the latest developments and brings new insights and inspiration to all. The subscription price for a year is only a dollar and every reader is urged to subscribe for it and read it regularly. He will find it serving as a monthly "shot in the arm," keeping him from becoming careless and indifferent.

CONVERSION STORIES

With the increased zeal for the sharing of the faith with the millions of our churchless neighbors, there has developed an increased interest in the stories of converts concerning the circumstances and the factors leading to their conversion. Consequently there has developed a very considerable literature on the spiritual experience of converts. It is of enormous interest and significance, as no story is more pregnant with human emotion on the highest level than the drama of the soul's quest for God.

Most of the stories are written by the converts themselves as no one but they can depict so authentically the gropings, the anxiety and the ultimate joy experienced as the pil-

grim pursues his journey to God's holy shrine. Each conversion is distinct with emotional undertones peculiar to the individual personality. In depicting that inner travail, turmoil, excitement, hunger, apprehension, satisfaction and rapture, the convert allows the outsider to see something of the mysterious workings of divine grace in the human soul.

The stories of initial bewilderment of the converts, their sense of void and cosmic loneliness, and of the torches which illumined their path to God are of enormous help to other searchers for the truth. While each journey will have emotional tones peculiar to the individual, there will be many signs along the highway that will be helpful to all travelers. Each pilgrim will be able to see in the experience of those who have preceded him, and who reached the goal, cues and pointers which will enable him to steer his course aright.

A STRANGER SPEAKS

Recently a stranger accosted us as we were crossing State Street in Chicago's busy commercial center. He explained that he had heard us preach at the Holy Name Cathedral during the Church Unity Octave and was interested in learning more about the Catholic Faith.

"I answered a K. of C. ad," he said, "and got a pamphlet explaining a particular doctrine of the Church.

But recently I read *Where I Found Christ*, and the stories of those converts have greatly intensified my interest. I feel that many of them had at the beginning some of my own prejudices and misgivings. Since reading how they cleared up their difficulties, I felt that I could do so also. It's reading that book which made me determined to talk to a priest and get some help . . . and you're the first one I've seen since then."

This illustrates the effect which the reading of such convert stories has upon many people who have been toying with the idea of looking into the teachings of the Catholic Church and need something to crystallize their feelings into a positive decision to act. Since people are not mere logic machines but are moved as much, if not more, by their feelings and emotions than by their thoughts, these convert stories with their stirring emotional undertones are just what are needed.

"I supplement," writes Msgr. James N. V. McKay of Kansas City, Missouri, "the doctrinal instruction I give an inquirer with a copy of *Where I Found Christ*, which I ask him to read during the course of instructions. I get excellent results. I find that the stories of these converts show him how others found the credentials of the Church virtually irresistible and they seem to whisper to him, 'Follow this trail and you

too will find Christ and peace and happiness.' Instructors of converts will find such convert stories an invaluable ally that will help them win practically every prospect for Christ."

GLADYS BAKER'S EXPERIENCE

An interesting corroboration of Monsignor McKay's experience comes from the pen of a recent convert, Gladys Baker, in her appealing volume, *I Had to Know*. She tells of her custom of many years of taking an assortment of books to bed with her so she would find at least one capable of holding her sustained interest until she finished it.

Then she continues:

And so the night after I was handed *The Road to Damascus*, I replenished my source of supplies, for I feared it might turn out to be a treatise on Catholicism. Scattered across my bed were two late mysteries, a book on contract-bridge strategy, a biography, a novel, and a forbidding tome on the state of the world. However, all these remained unopened while I went lickety-split through the slender red volume. Then for several nights following I gave it intensely concentrated study.

Here was a sharp departure from any book I had seen on Catholicism . . . a masterful innovation in editorship. Whereas books of Catholic doctrine *per se* had repelled me—as they have others—here was a fresh breeze cutting across the ordinarily stuffy presentation of philosophers and theologians. The contributors were from the top drawer of literary aristocracy. Here was a group of intellectuals revealing the most intimate experiences leading to their find-

ing of security at last in the arms of Mother Church—and revealing it as if a Pentecostal coal had touched their lips. Here were *diverse* avenues along which another pilgrim soul could walk in the direction of Rome and not feel in the company of strangers.

We cannot recommend too strongly the use of conversion stories both to interest prospects in the Faith and to help them appreciate the convincing character of its credentials and its divinely revealed doctrines. It is well for the lay apostle to familiarize himself with the stories of as many of these converts as possible so he will be able to cite their words and example when he is seeking to interest churchless people in the Faith. The way is long by precept, runs an old Latin proverb, but short by example. It is the example of others, especially those known for their intellectual achievements, which is likely to start the inquirer on the way to Christ's Church and to make the way short and easy to travel.

We present an annotated list of conversion stories which will help every worker in the convert apostolate. If each individual will keep four of these books in circulation among his non-church-going friends, he will find it an effective means of recruiting many persons for instruction. It would be enormously helpful if each parish or school library would acquire as many of these works as possible and keep them in constant circulation. There would be no dearth

of members for the Inquiry Classes in such parishes.

The Road to Damascus. Fifteen well-known converts—Clare Boothe Luce, Evelyn Waugh, Fulton Oursler, Senator Wagner—tell of their spiritual pilgrimage to the Church.

Where I Found Christ. Fourteen noted intellectuals—Thomas Merton, Dorothy Day, Jocelyn Toynbee, Avery Dulles, Christopher Hollis and others—tell the stories of their conversion to the Catholic Faith.

Paths to Christ. About forty people from all walks of life—teachers, mechanics, clerks, students, nurses, inventors and lawyers—tell of their conversion in a simple, down-to-earth manner.

The Way to Emmaus. Most of these eighteen converts were former ministers or students for the ministry. They give cogent and convincing reasons for their carefully-considered step in embracing Catholicism in the face of many obstacles.

The Pillar of Fire, Karl Stern. A Jewish psychiatrist's Odyssey of finding in the Catholic Church the fulfillment of Judaism.

A Spiritual Aeneid, Ronald A. Knox. The son of an Anglican bishop presents the considerations which drew him into the Catholic Church.

Now I See, Arnold Lunn. Candidly and good-humoredly, Mr. Lunn tells of his reversal from a spirited antagonist of the Church to one of her foremost converts.

Roman Road, George Lamb. A working-class family, a Cambridge education and the writings of Newman, Augustine and Chesterton were stepping-stones on this convert's path to Rome.

Beyond East and West, John C. Wu. A Chinese convert writes about his spiritual adventures that led to Christianity and finally to the Catholic Church.

The Long Road Home, John Moody. Primarily a spiritual autobiography of an internationally known financial writer and publisher.

What Other Answer?, Dorothy Fremont Grant. This might be called a sequel to *The Long Road Home* since its author was the "Uncle John" who sent Mrs. Grant on her way to Rome.

Apologia Pro Vita Sua, John Henry Newman. Written as a defense against the attacks of Charles Kingsley, the story of Cardinal Newman's conversion is a Catholic classic.

Dark Symphony, Elizabeth Laur Adams. Miss Adams enriches the tale of her conversion at eighteen with an understanding and explanation of the spiritual world of the Negro.

In the Shadow of Peter, Henry B. Shaw. The explicit record of a man's search for truth that took him from an Anglican seminary to the Catholic priesthood.

The Next Thing, Katherine Burton. Not only a convert story, but also the autobiography of an en-

thusiastic and often humorous writer.

House of Bread, C. J. Eustace. Upon the liberal background and philosophy of Eustace's youth, the doctrine of the Church had a tremendous effect that is traced in this book.

Along a Little Way, Frances Parkinson Keyes. "We instinctively refrain from sharing . . . the supreme experience of love and life . . . it seems, in a sense, a secret between ourselves and God." It is this "secret" which Mrs. Keyes shared in this book.

We Have Been Friends Together, Raissa Maritain. Unusually interesting memoirs of Raissa and Jacques Maritain, who came into the Church, led by Leon Bloy.

I Believed, Douglas Hyde. Formerly news editor of London's *Daily Worker*, Mr. Hyde became a Catholic after twenty years of zealous crusading in the Communist Party.

The Glory of Thy People, H. Raphael Simon. A Jewish convert who became a Cistercian monk writes his story. Preface by Bishop Fulton J. Sheen.

Slow Dawning, Jane Howes. From atheism to Catholicism is the road traveled in this spiritual autobiography.

The Seven Storey Mountain, Thomas Merton, Frater Louis' story of his conversion is almost a classic in Catholic literature.

Through Hundred Gates, edited by Severin and Stephen Lamping, O.F.M. From twenty-two countries and many walks of life come the men and women whose stories are in this book. They include Knute Rockne, Sigrid Undset and Prince Dimitri Galitzin.

A Roving Recluse, Peter F. Anson. Travel and life in a monastery are combined in this story of an Anglican's conversion to Catholicism.

The Divine Pursuit, Rachel Maria. A Russian Jewess married to a Protestant tells of her journey to the Catholic Church.

Roads to Rome. Fourteen noted scholars and writers—Alexis Carrel, A. J. Cronin, Gene Fowler, Mary O'Hara and others—disclose the unique and irresistible appeal of the Catholic religion and tell how they found peace and happiness.¹

¹ All the books mentioned in this article can be secured from your local Catholic book store.

Italian Immigrants

MOST REV. RICHARD J. CUSHING
Archbishop of Boston

Address to the American Committee on Italian Migration, New York, N. Y.,
December 3, 1953

FOR more and more of us in each generation, America is now not only our land of chosen preference but also our motherland. A generation ago a European country was the motherland of millions of Americans. At that time it was universally acknowledged to be quite proper that men should remain loyal to their natural motherland despite their obligations to their adopted motherland.

Nowadays we sometimes hear it said that those born in this country should forget what might be called their grandmother country. Such a suggestion runs counter to decent human instincts. Filial piety binds us to our own parents, but it also binds us to our grandparents, particularly when they need our affection and our support. Such is the law of Christianity. Such is also the voice of enlightened conscience. Such is the instinct of decent humanity.

And so in this matter of filial piety and humane interest toward the land of our ancestors, there should not be so sharp a distinction among first, second, or third generation Italians

or others when it is a question of generosity. Loyalty to America and generosity in her loving service are not inconsistent with a filial piety toward one's ancestral national family, particularly in repaying by kind deeds some of our debt to the land which gave us ancestors so worthy of our grateful piety.

OVERPOPULATION

We are not interested in becoming involved in Old World politics, but it is entirely proper and praiseworthy, I repeat, that we should seek to do something great and good for Italy in helping her solve the basic problem which plagues her progress toward the solution of most of her other problems.

This problem of overpopulation is one which should challenge the goodwill and generosity of anyone who has had the luck to be born. I shall never be able to understand how anyone who is himself blessed with the gift of existence, the chance to live and the opportunity to grow should wish to deny these to others. Certainly no Catholic Christian could

subscribe to any solution of the problem of overpopulation which would deny to others rights and privileges for which he is himself grateful and which he zealously seeks to preserve for himself and his own.

The American Committee on Italian Migration is therefore doing a mighty Christian and humanitarian work when it strives to bring to all Americans an accurate knowledge of the overpopulation problem in Italy and of the need for emigration as a partial and moral solution to these problems.

The American Ambassador to Italy has stated accurately and well the problem of the Italian nation to which you are directing public attention when she said:

Italians want what men and women everywhere want—a chance to earn a decent living for their families, and the opportunity to better the circumstances of their children. What troubles them most today is the backlog of overpopulation and consequently the existence of very large numbers of unemployed and underemployed people. Italy is a country relatively poor in natural resources, and so its present economy does not permit it to solve its major problem of overpopulation without some assistance from other nations.

AMERICAN WORK

At the same time Mrs. Luce indicated straightforwardly and with admirable frankness, as well as clarity, America's responsibility, as your committee understands it, too. She said:

Many people here hope to see America take a vigorous lead at a world level in the solution of this problem, not only taking in its fair share of people but even contributing its reasonable share to the financing and operation of a worldwide program in which all interested nations would cooperate for moving people to places where they can be economically productive. Overpopulation in Italy and other European countries is the greatest human problem that faces the West. Its solution would, I believe, be an incalculable blow to Communism in Italy, and elsewhere.

From what Mrs. Luce has said and from any commonsense point of view, it is perfectly obvious that whatever is done to help Italy relieve her particular problem of overpopulation is done in the interest of all the Western world.

It is my opinion that too many of our people are unaware of how essential Italy is and must always remain to the interests of the Western world. When we speak of our civilization as having its roots in the Mediterranean world, most people appear to think that we are referring to ancient history, to our debt to ancient Rome and ancient Greece. They seem to think that we mean only how much we owe to the poetry of Virgil, to the conquests of Caesar and to the cultural and political heritage of the Roman civilization.

Sometimes people extend their concept of Italy's place in the Western world to include the Italian heritage from the Middle Ages and, of course,

the Italian Renaissance. Beyond that, they seem to think that Italy's significance to Western civilization is restricted to a score or more tenors and sopranos and several million day laborers who have helped on construction jobs in other nations, including ours.

All this is very far from being the truth of the matter. The cultural debt of the Western world to Italy is, of course, enormous. The contribution of the Italian worker to every corner of the Western world is not less impressive. The part Italian genius has played in the scientific as well as artistic and religious enrichment of our civilization is beyond calculation.

MORE PRACTICAL

But there are even more practical considerations of a contemporary kind behind the contention that whatever strengthens Italy here and now, strengthens Western civilization—and whatever dooms Italy contributes proportionately to the destruction of the Western world.

Those who doubt this should look not only at the history books and the art books, but at an ordinary map. The Mediterranean world is not merely a cultural concept; it is also a geographical fact. The Mediterranean is still the sea highway between the East and the West. It is still the basin where mingle whatever forces for good or evil travel either eastward or westward, and the shores of Italy

are still, as in centuries past, washed with the worries of the West and the East. According as Italy is strong or weak, those worries are diminished or multiplied. According as Italy stands with the Western world or falls into the hands of the present masters of the East, faith and freedom, as we have traditionally understood them, are strengthened or become hostages in the hands of Italy's enemies and ours.

In seeking to serve Italy as you are doing, you are therefore serving the entire Western world—and, for that matter, the human family generally, for there is no need of soft-pedalling the fact that the future of all mankind depends on how soon the West, despite any and all its faults, will be able to join hands with the good people in their millions throughout the East who are languishing under despots who are hurting their own people quite as much as they are hating us.

In a most particular way, you are helping America by everything you do to bring to these shores the maximum number of Italian immigrants consistent with the national interest. Let me hasten to say that this phrase "consistent with the national interest" is not a weasel clause. It should be interpreted generously—and the burden of proof should be overwhelmingly on the backs of any who seek to restrict immigration from Italy rather than on those who seek to encourage

the coming into our land of persons devoted to Christian and democratic ideals.

The interests of our own country, of America, are richly served by a generous policy with regard to Italian immigration. Without flattery let me say that typical proof of that fact is present in this very room. There is no need of a rhetorical trip across the country or back through the pages of history to establish what the sons and daughters of Italy mean to the United States. Typical evidence is right before me. Many of you here present are living monuments, not only to what America has meant to Italy, but of what Italy has given to America.

AMERICAN SAINT

Last year you paid tribute to Mother Cabrini. You called her "The Italian Immigrant of the Century." She was a nun, a woman devoted to the spiritual and the corporal works of mercy. And yet she was typical in many and important ways of the Italian immigrant generally. She brought to these shores in heroic degree values which have all been present in the countless thousands of others who share her national background.

I need not rehearse those values. They were effectively presented in your program a year ago. She exemplified, of course, the religious faith of the Italian people. Millions of other

Italians have brought that same faith into thousands of American cities, towns and villages. More than 150 institutions bear her name: orphanages, schools and centers for moral and physical health. But most of these, I can easily guess, and tens of thousands of other like beneficent institutions were built by the toil and in no small measure financed by the generosity of countless of her anonymous compatriots.

The accomplishments of Mother Cabrini stand as a rebuke to any who attempt to raise barriers against the worthy immigrants. So do the accomplishments of millions of immigrants less well known, not only from her country, but from all over the world.

America is an immigrant nation. It is unintelligible how a nation settled and made strong by immigration, as this nation has been, could ever produce people unsympathetic to the plight of the immigrant or unwilling to extend a cordial welcome to those who are driven by sad necessity from the land of their ancestors to seek survival in this land of blessed opportunity.

Important reasons of an almost selfish kind may easily be added to humanitarian considerations as arguments for generous immigration policies, particularly in favor of Italians. Our nation is faced with a very real agricultural problem. The balance between our industrial and metropolitan areas on the one hand and

our farm areas on the other is precarious, to say no more; it is becoming more so and may yet take a turn completely disastrous to the national stability, economic as well as cultural.

WHERE?

Only last week a newspaper columnist, reporting on his airplane trip from the West Coast to New York, stated something which has certainly occurred to anyone who has ever flown across the United States. He said that once his plane left the coastal area of California, and except in the few cities like Denver, Chicago and others which come immediately to mind, he found himself asking as he looked out of his plane: "Where is everybody?" He said that this question kept running through his mind as he gazed across the seemingly limitless expanse of American rural, farm and cattle country territory.

The answer is, of course, that not everybody, but altogether too many people for our own good, are in the big cities. As far as food production goes, the parasitic and dependent part of our population is enormously out of proportion to the part which produces food—and the disproportion becomes increasingly grave with each passing year as farm areas are deserted by young people from families which have become bored with a long history of farming.

New blood could not only be used, but is badly needed in the farming

areas of the United States. Even as I say these things I am mindful of the hopes which Bishop Spalding of Peoria entertained back in 1884 when he argued that many States would provide admirable farming centers for the peasants of Lombardy and other sections of Italy. His vision found very little practical support at the time and altogether too few Italian immigrants found their way to the farming districts. This was all the worse for them and in some ways for America.

Nowadays a like idea could be implemented by the better organization we now have for rural life programs, immigration procedure and the whole setup of Catholic and civic provisions for the care of immigrants.

Your own committee might well add to its objectives that of exploring the tremendous possibilities of correlating Italy's need for emigration and America's need for the strengthening of her agricultural potential in areas where that potential is declining and where her countryside already shows serious signs of abandonment, even before it has been adequately developed.

American national interests of a material kind would be served in other ways by a policy of maximum liberality in favor of Italian immigration. So would our national interests on what we might call the psychological and cultural level.

A brilliant author recently re-

marked that it would be a great loss to America if the spontaneity, sparkle and gaiety of the Italian temperament should be undervalued, for it can contribute much to the America of the future. Italians have shown a remarkable capacity for ready assimilation into the political, economic and religious pattern of American life, while retaining these attractive qualities of their ancestors. The assimilation of Italians has been more rapid than that of many other immigrants, partly because traditionally the Italian has had a tender patriotism rather than a fanatic nationalism in his attitude toward the Old Country. As a result, Italians who come to this country usually retain their cherished traditions of a religious, local or family character, but lose no time in mastering the language and the other common traditions of the American community.

That is why I never see much point or fun in portrayals of the so-called stage-type Italian nowadays. It is not the primary purpose of your committee, I know, but I think it would help if people like yourselves discouraged radio, theater, movie and cartoon at-

tempts to represent Italians as semi-comic characters of a half-amusing, half-pathetic type.

I meet many, many thousands of Italians, but only on the radio and in the comic papers do I encounter these eccentric stage-type Italians, and almost all of them are portrayed by people with no drop of Italian blood.

You may wonder why I bother to mention a point like this. The reason is very simple and very serious: stereotypes and caricatures are obstacles to the progress of a cause like yours, the cause of educating America and the organized world community to the reasons why the Italian people are a substantial part of our civilization's best hope—and why America should open her doors with generous wisdom to those for whom you are working with such marvelous generosity and such magnificent devotion.

God bless your work. I have already said that with the patronage and leadership you have you don't seem to need the help of us lesser fry, but if I can serve, I am yours to command.



Portress of Heaven

All the saints had great devotion to Our Lady. They realized that no grace comes from Heaven without passing through her hands. We cannot enter a house without first speaking to the porter; similarly, the Holy Virgin is the portress of Heaven and we cannot gain entrance there without calling upon her aid.—THE MAGNIFICAT, July, 1954.

On Controlling Anger

DERMOTT McLOUGHLIN, O.F.M.

*Reprinted from the WAY OF ST. FRANCIS**

THE INVENTION of the atomic bomb was hailed by many Americans as a great step forward in the development of our national defense. And presumably, as the production of yet greater and more powerful weapons goes on, our country becomes ever stronger and safer, and the preservation of our lives and liberties more assured.

But far from bringing a sense of security to the American people, the news about these mighty forces of destruction has had an opposite effect. There is an uneasy feeling that our new-found strength may be more of a threat to our safety than a protection; that perhaps America has brought forth a monster that will some day turn against her. It would not be the first time that great power backfired against those who used it.

Luckily, the majority of men have no access to the use or misuse of such titanic forces as that of atomic energy. But there is a force in human nature which each person uses only at his own peril. Its effects are in no way so drastic or spectacular as the destruction wrought by giant bombs, but they can penetrate more deeply into the human soul.

It is the passion of anger, that instinctive mechanism of defense in human nature, which is so easily aroused and so difficult to control. There are occasions when it serves a necessary or useful purpose, spurring one on to determined action to right a wrong or prevent an evil. But more often than not, for lack of proper caution and control, it is like an explosion that backfires, a weapon that inflicts more harm on the user than on those against whom it is directed.

It is seldom that anyone gives way to anger without being the worse for it afterwards. And that is true not only of the intense rage that leads to crimes of violence and to the penalties one must pay for such crimes, but also of the ordinary displays of temper that average people indulge in because of petty differences, mishaps and thoughtlessly spoken words.

Anger is the common defense of injured feelings and wounded pride,

* 109 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco 2, Calif.

but rarely does such a method of defense accomplish anything except to deepen the injury and intensify hard feelings. More often than not, the damages wrought by loss of temper are out of all proportion to the incident that causes it, so readily does anger grow by what it feeds on.

SELF-INJURY

Especially when anger deepens into hatred or a settled resentment toward another does it become an instrument of self-injury. It breeds in the soul a rankling, festering bitterness which robs the soul of its serenity and peace. Worse still, it raises a barrier between the soul and God. "For if you forgive men their offenses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you your offenses. But if you do not forgive men, neither will your Father forgive you your offenses."

Centuries ago Saint Augustine wrote, "No enemy could be more dangerous to us than the hatred with which we hate him, and by our efforts against him we do less damage to our enemy than is wrought in our own heart."

All this is true, and knowing that it is true should be an incentive to be always on guard within us, with the determination to repress anger before the damage is done. But reason alone is no match for a passion such as anger. "Quarry the granite rock with a razor," writes Cardinal Newman, "moor the vessel with thread of silk, and then you may hope with such a delicate instrument as human reason to control those monsters, the human passions."

No, to become truly free and secure from the domination of temper, we must cultivate deep in ourselves by prayer and practice an opposing force, a counteracting habit, that will gradually snuff out the vice of anger at its roots. Our Divine Master prescribed it for us when He declared, "Blessed are the meek," and again, "Learn of Me, for I am meek and humble of heart."

It is not so much a matter of forcibly suppressing our anger, as of learning to alter our reactions to persons and incidents, so that our temper is, for the most part, left undisturbed. The man who is meek, in the Christian sense of the word, can take a rebuke or a mishap tranquilly, because his meekness is grounded in humility and nourished by charity. He is too humble to take offense easily, and his charity moves him to make generous allowances for the faults of others.

To develop the virtue of meekness is an enriching and soul-satisfying accomplishment, not only in the freedom it gives from a multitude of need-

less disturbances, but also in the good it does to others. For gentleness disarms hostility and wrath, while anger merely provokes anger in return. It is a great achievement and a real work of Christian charity to melt another's anger with a kind word when a harsh one might seem justified, to avert quarrels and bitterness by meeting anger with gentleness.

It is a work of mercy, a form of Christian apostolate, recommended by the Savior: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God."



Catechism and Peace

The little catechism that we studied as children (and should review constantly) is a precious book. It is a compendium of the truths that will make us happy here on earth and, of much more consequence, eternally happy in Heaven. To achieve this happiness we must put these truths into practice.

Early in this remarkable summation of Christian doctrine a query is posed, "What is man?" The response merits careful consideration. "Man is a creature composed of a body and soul and made to the image and likeness of God."

This is humanity's noblest heritage. We are made in God's image. Further elucidation brings out the point that this likeness is chiefly in the soul. The soul is by far the more important component of man.

The world is a seething cauldron of hatred today because this eternal truth is either rejected or ignored. Millions deny the human soul. They immediately reduce men to the status of the lower animals. He has no more moral responsibility than brute creation. He is robbed of any claim to worth and dignity here on earth.

National and racial hatred springs from the denial of this common Christian heritage. The truths expressed in the catechism are true not for Catholics alone but for all mankind. We inherit a common brotherhood through our common likeness as children of God. Once we concede that all men are made in the image and likeness of God, we must love all men, regardless of color, race, nationality, or social status.

In our most essential part, our soul, we are all alike and therefore all brothers and sisters. Let that truth sink into the East and West, and we shall achieve the universal brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God.—CATHOLIC UNIVERSE
BULLETIN, Cleveland, Ohio, April 30, 1954.

The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination

THE HON. ROBERT McWILLIAMS
Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco, Cal.

A talk to a private discussion club, San Francisco, Cal., April 12, 1954

THE Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides in part that no one "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." Our California Constitution contains a similar provision in identical language. That latter provision has been amplified by Section 2065 of our Code of Civil Procedure, which reads in part as follows:

A witness must answer questions legal and pertinent to the matter in issue, though his answer may establish a claim against himself; but he need not give an answer which will have a tendency to subject him to punishment for a felony . . .

All of the States of the Union with the exception of Iowa and New Jersey contain similar provisions and in those two States the principle is in effect as a part of the common law of the State.

The courts have construed our Federal constitutional provision as meaning that a person may stand mute not only on the trial of civil and criminal cases but also before grand juries and legislative committees if a criminal charge could be asserted against the witness with respect to any

matter as to which he might be called upon to testify.

How did such a doctrine come into existence? If suspicious circumstances suggest that a certain person committed a burglary or that he is a party to a conspiracy to overthrow the government by force, why should he not be called upon to explain those suspicious circumstances?

Said Jeremy Bentham, who did much to reform our law of evidence, writing over a hundred years ago, in speaking of this doctrine:

From his own mouth you will not receive the evidence of the culprit against himself; but from the mouth of another you receive it without scruple; so that at bottom all this sentimentality resolves itself into neither more nor less than predilection, a confirmed and most extensive predilection for bad evidence.

A consideration of the origin of the doctrine of privilege against self-incrimination takes us back into Roman and early English history. Under the Roman law, judges, though instructed to act impartially, were directed to question freely, to make a full inquiry of witnesses—*plena inquisizione* was the phrase employed in the Code of Theodosius. Whenever

the law so permitted, the judge could cause the accused to be subjected to torture for the purpose of obtaining a confession. Torture was always authorized in cases of treason. The torture of certain privileged classes was forbidden. Torture, I may add, was an institution of Roman origin, according to Esmein, a great name in early criminal procedure.

EARLY ENGLISH LAW

According to James Bradley Thayer, one of our leading authorities on the early English law of evidence, in the year 829 Louis the First, King of the Franks, issued a capitulary or law decreeing that every inquiry relating to the royal treasury should be made by inquisition. In other words, taxes were to be imposed, services exacted and personal status fixed on the basis of the sworn answers of selected persons residing in the neighborhood involved. The persons appointed for that purpose were those who were likely to know who was in possession of certain land and by what title. They knew the feudal status of their neighbors. This duty of compiling information was at times delegated by the Crown to representatives of the Church and also to individuals.

In the latter part of the eleventh century the Normans brought this form of the inquisition with them when they invaded England. The best known example of the use of it in

England is to be found in the well-known *Domesday* book, a statistical survey of England compiled in 1085 under William the Conqueror. Residents of the various communities throughout England who were in a position to supply information were first put on oath by commissioners in charge of the task. In the only portion of the *Domesday* book that had a territorial name the term *inquisitio eliensis* was employed in referring to it.

Up to about the time of Henry the Second, who reigned from 1154 to 1189 and who is said to have for the first time instituted a reign of law in England, the common method of trial of offenses was by superstitious practices such as the ordeal. By one form of that procedure a suspect was required to carry a piece of hot iron in his hand for a certain distance. His hand was then bandaged. If after three days it was found to be undamaged, the innocence of the accused was thereby proved; otherwise he was guilty. Another method of trial was the use of compurgators or oath-helpers who merely swore to their belief in the truthfulness of the oath of the party accused.

When these ancient methods of trial fell into disfavor, a new method was developed. It consisted of putting an accused under oath and requiring him to swear to his innocence. It was employed in the law courts and also in the ecclesiastical courts, which then

had exclusive jurisdiction over cases involving wills and marriages, as well as of hearing trials for heresy. The accused was required to appear in person without counsel to answer the charge made against him.

If he did not immediately confess or satisfactorily explain the charge, he was subjected to what was called an interrogatory examination. Originally, a person could not be subjected to such an examination unless the matter was brought to a judge's notice *per famam* (by common report) or *per clamorosam insinuationem* (by strong suspicion).

EX-OFFICIO OATH

But in time those conditions came to be disregarded, and the proceeding degenerated into what the late Professor Wigmore, whose ten-volume work made him our leading authority on the law of evidence, has called "A merely unlawful process of poking about in the speculation of finding something chargeable." In this latter stage the suspect was subjected to what came to be known and with high disfavor as the *ex-officio* oath. The almost inevitable result of this type of interrogation, unrestrained by law, was the employment of torture in order to secure confessions and thereby to simplify the task of preparing criminal cases for trial. Particularly was this so in an era when the criminal laws were incredibly severe and punishment incredibly harsh.

Although very few formal admissions of the use of torture are to be found in the books except in cases involving treason, one English writer who investigated the subject back in 1837 reported that, among others, he had found cases of torture ordered in prosecutions for murder, robbery, embezzlement and horse-stealing. I may add that he reported finding no case involving torture after 1640.

According to Phipson, an able authority on the law of evidence in England, the first consideration of the doctrine that one may not be required to incriminate himself is found in the case of *Cullier vs. Cullier* (about 1590) decided in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. The defendant in that case was prosecuted for incontinency, as the opinion in the case delicately phrases it. The judges undertook to examine the defendant under oath. Chief Justice Coke prohibited them from so doing, holding that such an inquisition could only be resorted to in testamentary and matrimonial cases.

The leading early English case involving this subject of the privilege against self-incrimination was decided in the year 1616 during the reign of James the First. It came before the Court of High Commission, a special ecclesiastical court established by Henry the Eighth to handle cases involving church discipline and doctrine. The case involved one John Burrowes, and others, who had been

committed, following their arrest, for refusing to take an oath prior to their interrogation. The court held that the defendants could not be detained on that ground. Chief Justice Coke in his opinion cited three earlier decisions rendered during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I as holding that *nemo tenetur se ipsum prodere* ("no one is obliged to incriminate himself").

Possibly the most colorful description we have of a case involving the use or attempted use of the ex-officio oath is to be found in the report of the prosecution of John Lilburn in the year 1637 by the Council of the Star Chamber. Lilburn had been arrested for sending allegedly seditious libels from Holland into England. Following his arrest he was taken to the office of the Attorney-General for interrogation. The Chief Clerk handled the preliminary stage of the interrogation which, throughout, has all of the atmosphere of a well-conducted contemporaneous Congressional committee investigation.

According to Lilburn's description of the incident, as set forth in Howell's State Trials, the Chief Clerk, one Cockshey by name, at the outset "did kindly entreat me and made me sit down by him, put on my hat and began with me after this manner. Mr. Lilburn, what is your Christian name?" Then followed a number of questions, most of which Lilburn answered; but at last he refused to go further, saying: "I know it is war-

rantable by the law of God, and I think by the law of the land, that I may stand on my just defense, and not answer your interrogatories, and that my accusers ought to be brought face to face, to justify what they accuse me of." He was afterwards asked by the Attorney-General to sign the transcript of his testimony but refused so to do, although he offered to write out a statement of his own in regard to the matters charged against him.

The hearing of the case was continued until a later date, at which time Lilburn and his co-defendants were asked to take the oath, which they refused to do. After a second refusal to take the oath, they were remanded to the Fleet prison, there to remain until they cleared themselves of the charge of contempt. They were also fined five hundred pounds. It was further ordered that Lilburn should be whipped through the street from the Fleet prison to the pillory, which was to be erected at a time and place directed by the court, following which punishment the judgment of the court directed that he be returned to the Fleet prison there to remain until further action by the court.

It is refreshing to learn, however, that the House of Lords subsequently learned of the matter and decided that the action taken in the lower court was illegal. Said the judgment of the House of Lords:

It is this day adjudged, ordered and determined by the Lords in Parliament

assembled that the said sentence and all proceedings thereupon shall forthwith be forever totally vacated, obliterated and taken off the file in all courts where they are yet remaining, as illegal, and most unjust, against the liberty of the subject, and law of the land, and Magna Charta and . . . the said Lilburn shall be forever absolutely freed and totally discharged from the said sentence and all proceedings thereupon, as fully and amply as though never had any such thing been.

At a still later date, according to the records, Lilburn was awarded three thousand pounds in reparation for his sufferings.

In this country, six of the colonies had embodied the privilege against self-incrimination in their constitutions before the adoption of our Federal Constitution. As I stated at the outset, the privilege against self-incrimination is found in our State constitutions in all but two States, in which two States it has been held to exist under the common law.

SOUND REASON

There must be some sound reason underlying this unanimity of opinion that one should not be required to incriminate himself. I have already pointed out the extent to which the lack of any such prohibition in England led the courts in the way of inflicting torture on persons accused of crime in an effort to force them to confess. The doctrine under consideration had its origin, according to our California Supreme Court, in

the abhorrence with which confessions coerced by inquisitorial torture were regarded alike in England and in America. Said our Supreme Court, quoting from Professor Wigmore:

The real objection is that any system of administration which permits the prosecution to trust habitually to compulsory self-disclosure as a source of proof must itself suffer morally thereby. The inclination develops to rely mainly upon such evidence, and to be satisfied with an incomplete investigation of the other sources (3 Cal. [2d] p. 394.)

Would it be safe to assume that that danger no longer exists in our supposedly more enlightened age and that therefore the doctrine need no longer be imbedded in the rock of our constitutional system?

The answer would seem to be in the negative in view of the cases involving the so-called third degree which, they indicate, is still occasionally employed by police departments throughout the nation. Arthur Train, well-known writer and former Assistant District Attorney in New York City, in his book *Courts, Criminals and the Camorra*, published in 1912, expressed himself upon this subject as follows:

When it comes to the more important cases, the accused is usually put through some sort of an inquisitorial process by the Captain of the Station House. If he is not very successful at getting anything out of the prisoner, the latter is turned over to the Sergeant and a couple of officers who can use methods of a more urgent character. If the prisoner is arrested by head-

quarters detectives, various efficient devices to compel him to "give up what he knows" may be used—such as depriving him of food and sleep, placing him in a cell with a stool-pigeon who will try to worm a confession out of him and the usual suasion of a heart-to-heart (!) talk in the back room with the inspector.

I should add that Mr. Train also expressed his belief that, except in unusual cases, the rigors of the so-called third degree have been greatly exaggerated.

That it has not been completely abolished, however, is testified to by the records of our courts. Thus, in the case of one McNabb charged with the murder of an officer of the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, it was brought out on the trial in 1942 that the defendants, before being brought before a committing officer, had been put in a cell for fourteen hours after which they were subjected to unremitting questioning for two days, being denied in the meantime the aid of friends or the benefit of counsel. The statements made by them were as a consequence held by the Supreme Court of the United States to be inadmissible.

USED BY SUBVERSIVES

Attorney-General Brownell recently called attention to a fact that has become a matter of common knowledge, namely, that subversives and criminals are now relying on the privilege against self-incrimination to

avoid answering questions that might result in their prosecution. He therefore has recommended that the nation's safety will be better served if testimony of witnesses can be compelled upon a grant of immunity from criminal prosecution. This suggestion is not novel and is entirely feasible under the law, provided proper care is used in the drafting of such legislation.

In 1857 a statute was passed by Congress which granted a legislative pardon for any act regarding which a witness might testify. It did more harm than good. One United States Senator informed the Senate that the law afforded inducement to the worst criminals to appear and testify before investigating committees in order thereby to render themselves immune from prosecution for their offenses. He cited an instance of one witness who had unlawfully taken \$2 million in bonds from the Department of the Interior. An indictment against him was quashed because he had made some statement about the matter in testifying before a Congressional committee.

In 1893, after two prior ineffectual attempts to enact a valid statute, Congress passed a law dealing with witnesses before the Interstate Commerce Commission. It provided in substance that no one should be excused from testifying or from producing records before that body but that, if he did so, such person should not be prose-

cuted on account of any matter concerning which he might so testify. The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Brown vs. Walker*, by a five-to-four decision, upheld the statute. Mr. Justice Field in his dissenting opinion posed the question: "What can be more abhorrent than to compel a man who has fought his way from obscurity to dignity and honor to reveal crimes of which he has repented and of which the world was ignorant?" Notwithstanding the four dissenting opinions, the majority opinion has stood, and today many States, including California, have enacted statutes based on the precedent that was then established.

Those statutes, however, have usually been restricted in their scope. Thus, in this State [California] from an early date we had a statute protecting a witness who gave testimony in a case involving a prosecution of a person for obtaining money to influence a legislative vote. You may also be relieved to learn that, ever since 1872, any testimony that any of you might be required to give as to your having engaged in a duel may not be used against you in a criminal prosecution. Similarly, any testimony that you might be required to give as to your having engaged in a prize-fight, as distinguished from an amateur boxing exhibition, may not be used against you. Nevertheless, though that particular testimony could not be so used, under the hold-

ing of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Counselman vs. Hitchcock* (1892), you could still be prosecuted if the authorities could secure the necessary evidence of your guilt from some other source, even though that other evidence was secured through the *lead* supplied by your testimony. Since those statutes do not foreclose a prosecution but merely prohibit the direct use of the testimony given by you, you are therefore not protected by them and could refuse to answer any incriminating questions.

Our various California immunity statutes on this subject were revised and consolidated in one section by the 1953 Legislature. That section provides in substance that in any criminal proceeding or in any investigation before a Grand Jury for any violation of certain specified offenses, if a person refuses to answer a question on the ground that he may be incriminated thereby and if the District Attorney requests the Superior Court of that county to order the witness to answer the question, the Superior Court shall so order, unless it finds that to do so would be clearly contrary to the public interest. The statute further provides that, after complying, such a person may not be prosecuted on account of any fact concerning which he is required to answer (P.C. Sec. 1324). This section does more than provide that the evidence given may not thereafter be

used against the witness in a subsequent prosecution, as did the earlier statutes which were held to give inadequate protection. It provides that the person may not be prosecuted concerning *any matter regarding which he is required to testify*.

BILLS PENDING

Two bills are now pending before Congress which would amend the present Federal law on the subject and compel witnesses to answer questions put to them. In exchange for their testimony the witnesses, as under our recent California law, would obtain immunity from prosecution. Under the provisions of one, known as the Kefauver bill, a witness who testifies before a Federal Court or a Grand Jury thereby secures immunity when, in the discretion of the Attorney General, it is deemed advisable in the public interest to grant him such immunity. This bill does not, however, grant immunity to witnesses before Congressional committees.

Another bill, supported by Senator McCarran, is similar in its purpose and effect. It does grant immunity to witnesses before Congressional committees, however. But, unlike the Kefauver bill, the discretion to grant immunity is not vested in the Attorney General but in the body conducting the investigation. The Department of Justice does not look with favor on the McCarran bill by reason of its failure to provide that the Attorney

General shall participate in any grant of immunity that may be made. In the view of that department, the Attorney General is the chief legal officer of the Federal Government and, as such, has the duty and responsibility to prosecute criminals. It would be inadvisable, in the opinion of the Department of Justice, to have other persons vested with an authority that might prevent the Attorney General from fully performing his duty. In the opinion of Senator McCarran and a majority of his fellow members on the Judiciary Committee, the body conducting the hearing could adequately treat that problem by securing the views of the Attorney General in accordance with a rule formulated by it.

Two major objections have been advanced to legislation of the type embodied in the bills mentioned. One objection is that when a witness is compelled to testify, he is not relieved from the disgrace incident to the exposure of his crime. This objection, it will be recalled, was also urged before the Supreme Court when it was considering the case of *Brown vs. Walker*, to which I referred before. The court there answered that the purpose of the privilege is not to aid the witness in vindicating his reputation, but to protect him from being compelled to furnish evidence to convict him of a criminal charge. It added that if the witness secures immunity from prosecution, the possible

impairment of his reputation was a penalty which it was but reasonable that he should be compelled to pay for the common good.

The second objection to the proposed legislation is that it would not protect a witness from prosecution under State law. But the Supreme Court has held that that is not a valid objection to such legislation.

The latest holding of the U. S. Supreme Court dealing with the subject under consideration is to be found in an opinion rendered on March 8, 1954 in the case of *Adams vs. Maryland*. It had to do with the matter of waiver of the privilege against self-incrimination. A witness called before a Congressional committee confessed to having run a gambling business in the State of Maryland. That confession was used in a Maryland State court to convict him of violating a State statute against lotteries. A Federal statute enacted in 1857 and still on the books provides that no testimony given by a witness before any Congressional committee shall be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding against him "in any court." In the State court the prosecution contended that the defendant had waived his privilege of not testifying before the committee by not refusing to give testimony on the ground that by so testifying he would incriminate himself. The prosecution prevailed in the State court. That court held that in the absence

of a refusal to answer followed by a compulsion to respond, no immunity arises.

The holding of the State court was reversed by the United States Supreme Court. It held that, under the language of the Federal statute, a defendant is not required to claim his privilege by refusing to testify. It said that the Fifth Amendment by its terms took care of that. It further held that the contention that the Federal statute barred the use of such testimony in Federal but not in State courts was untenable in view of the language of the statute which provides, it will be recalled, that testimony given before a Congressional committee shall not be used in a criminal proceeding "in any court." This decision clarifies the law on these matters, dispelling a contrary impression which had existed in the profession for many years.

Obviously, many phases of the subject of the privilege against self-incrimination have not been discussed by me. These include, among others, the mode of claiming the privilege and, more importantly, the inference that may properly be drawn from a claim of the privilege. Unfortunately, the limitations of time will not permit a discussion of them. At least, I trust that I have given you a picture of the historical background of the privilege that may have been of some interest to you.

(On August 4 the House of Repre-

sentatives amended and passed Senate Bill 16, to which Judge McWilliams refers in his text. As amended by that body, it provides that under certain conditions no witness shall be excused from testifying before a congressional committee on the ground that his testimony may tend to incriminate him in the event that two-thirds of the members of the committee shall have authorized the granting of immunity to the witness. The first condition is that the United

States District Court of the district wherein the inquiry is being conducted has made an order requiring the witness to testify. The second condition is that the committee may not grant immunity to the witness without having first notified the Attorney General of the United States of its proposed action and given him an opportunity to be heard. After favorable action in the Senate, the President signed the bill on August 20.—Ed.)



Together on the Precipice

If this world were threatened with an invasion of beings from another planet we would have little trouble in agreeing even with the Soviets on a plan for joint defense. If a universal plague swept down upon the earth, the differences between Capitalist and Communist would not stand in the way of a pooling of information and a union of effort to stave off the menace. Why then are the prospects so dim for finding some measure of common ground with the Kremlin? The matter at hand is hardly less urgent. Rational means must be found to avert the danger of universal destruction by the fire, the blast, the radiation and the atmospheric contamination resulting from nuclear explosions. Natural catastrophes—earthquakes, floods, plagues—cannot be prevented by human industry. But man should be able to prevent catastrophes of which he alone is the cause. If men throughout the world today are not setting their brains and hands more strongly to the work of preventing the human catastrophe of atomic war, the reason is a simple one: men do not yet understand or appreciate their own danger.—Hon. Thomas E. Murray, member, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, at Catholic University, Washington, D. C., June 8, 1954.

Attitude toward the "Index"

THE REV. JOHN S. KENNEDY

Reprinted from the CATHOLIC TRANSCRIPT*

GRAHAM GREENE is quoted as saying of the Church's *Index of Forbidden Books*:

In common with many other Catholics, I have little regard for the Index in the rare cases when it deals with imaginative writing. The Roman Index is not an infallible document and sometimes makes mistakes as absurd and regrettable as British judges, juries, and magistrates. However, it is mainly concerned not with questions of obscenity but points of theology and philosophy . . . So far as imaginative literature is concerned . . . most Catholics follow their own consciences.

"Absurd and regrettable," words right off Mr. Greene's pen, exactly apply to parts of his statement.

Not that there is no truth at all in what he says. Thus, the *Index* does indeed deal with imaginative writing somewhat infrequently. Again, it is not "an infallible document." And still again, there have been cases where it may be said a mistake has been made; for example, concerning writings by Copernicus and Galileo.

But Mr. Greene is wrong, regrettably and even absurdly wrong, in some particulars.

For one thing, he suggests, al-

though he does not categorically say, that mistakes in putting books on the *Index* occur rather often. This impression is given by the link he establishes between it and "British judges, juries, and magistrates." The latter, one may be sure, make mistakes fairly frequently. But, invariably, to illustrate the possibility of mistakes where the *Index* is concerned, reference is made to writings by Copernicus and Galileo. Copernicus died 400 years ago; Galileo died 300 years ago.

Mr. Greene may be *factually* right when he says: "I have little regard for the *Index* when it deals with imaginative writing." No one knows as well as he what his own attitude and practice are. It is doubtful that he is *factually* right when he says that "many other Catholics" are at one with him in this.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE INDEX

In any case, he and any other Catholics who share his views are *morally* wrong in lightly regarding or disregarding, the *Index*. There is a moral obligation for the Catholic,

whoever he is, to heed it. To do otherwise, is to reject the moral authority of the Church and to commit sin.

More than that, there is a special obligation for the prominent and influential Catholic to set a good example in this matter, and not to give scandal, gratuitously and grievously, as Mr. Greene is doing in a way deliberate and culpable.

It is always possible to get permission to read books on the *Index*, provided one has a reason for doing so which the competent authority judges sufficient.

While it is true, as Mr. Greene states, that the *Index* is not "mainly concerned . . . with questions of obscenity but points of theology or philosophy," it is also true that such works of imaginative literature as are put on the *Index* are proscribed precisely because of the false theology or philosophy which they exemplify.

Actually, there would be no need for the Church to single out for banning a novel or a set of novels which is obscene. The natural law itself prohibits the reading of what is obscene. And the natural law binds everyone without exception. It is flatly impossible to read the obscene in good conscience, whether or not the Church has pronounced on it. Thus, I am not free to read an obscene book simply because it has not been put on the *Index*. The very fact of its obscenity rules it out.

But to get back to the question of

false theology or philosophy. Take an example from contemporary imaginative writing: the novels of Jean-Paul Sartre. Sartre's works have been placed on the *Index*. Why?

I have seen no explanation of the reasons for the prohibition. I would surmise, however, that, in part, these reasons have to do with immorality, which figures so conspicuously and so constantly in Sartre's fiction. Some time before the ban was announced, I had resolved to read no more of his novels. Those that I had gone through for review reeked so of wanton nastiness that I felt I could not conscientiously read any more of them.

EXISTENTIALISM

Yet there was more behind the decision than that, I feel sure. For Sartre's imaginative writing conveys very forcefully a philosophy of life called Existentialism, utterly at odds with not merely the Christian philosophy, but also any merely natural philosophy not tainted with perversity.

This fact is indicated in an editorial in the latest issue of *The Saturday Review*. There the philosophy of Existentialism is called "nihilist." "Nihilism" is defined by the dictionary as "a doctrine which denies any objective or real ground of truth or of moral principles." The editorial further says that Existentialism denies the possibility of "unraveling the ultimate mystery of existence," that it

holds man to be justified "in catering to his own will," that it denies "the moral content in human affairs," that its spirit is one of "defeatism" and "emotional and moral corrosion." And much more along the same lines.

Mr. Greene would lead the unwary to believe that imaginative writing could be put on the *Index* only be-

cause of its morality. This is flatly untrue. Imaginative writing may, as in Sartre's case, be a deadly means of communicating a poisonous philosophy, and its banning as such is amply justified.

Mr. Greene certainly comes nowhere near the heart of the matter in his most unfortunate remarks.



Role of the Pope

The chief desire of the Western world is to see in the Pope a moral authority who will keep before the eyes of governments the terrible picture of human catastrophe which could follow from the use of modern weapons of war, and who will beg the nations to make agreements to limit their development and use.

But there is also the desire to see the Pope as a diplomatist who will use the presence of the Catholic Church—the one institution which remains strong in the Communist-dominated countries as well as in the free world—to maintain at least some links between a sundered East and West. Newspapers like to interpret what are termed the policies of the Holy See, as though the judgments made could be adaptable, emphasized here and soft-pedalled there, according to the shifting balance of relations between governments. Some are even prepared to see the Pope as a sort of Western counterpart of Mr. Nehru, ready for comparable reasons to avoid any ultimate commitment to either part of a divided world, who can be admired and perhaps held in reserve as a mediator.

It is true the Pope speaks on such matters as the use of modern weapons of warfare with an authority that no other man can command. It is true that the Holy See is uniquely well placed to work for peace among the nations; although the death of St. Pius X, hastened, it is said, by sorrow when, despite all that he could do, the first world war was unleashed, is a reminder of what little attention is in fact paid by the statesmen when the gravest moments come. But it is also true that the tasks of the Pope are set at a more profound level than this, in the knowledge that war, however evil, is not the ultimate evil, and that the relations of men with each other, while of immense importance, are trivial in comparison to their relations with God.—*TABLET* (London), June 5, 1954.

Documentation

Institutes of Teaching Brothers

POPE PIUS XII

Letter to His Eminence Valerio Cardinal Valeri, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Religious Orders and Institutes.

OUR BELOVED SON, HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION

THE Procurators General of eight Religious Institutes of Brothers, whose special mission is the instruction and education of youth, have presented Us with an official report of the annual meeting of the French Provinces of their Institutes, held last year at Paris, in order to inform Us of what had been accomplished there, and what they hope to accomplish in the future. At the same time, they besought Us in a submissive and respectful spirit to give them Paternal instruction and to point out to them the best means to increase their numbers and to achieve the happiest results in their recruitment of vocations.

That is what We gladly do in succinct form by means of this letter. And in the first place, We congratulate them very much, because We know with what zealous and untiring will these Brothers are fulfilling the mission confided to them, a mission that can be of the greatest assistance to the Church, to the family and to civil society itself. Indeed, their work is of great importance. Boys and young men are the blossoming hope of the future. And the course of events in the years ahead will depend especially upon those young men who are instructed in the liberal arts and every type of discipline, so that they may assume the direction not only of their private affairs but also of public matters. If their minds are illumined by the light of the Gospel, if their wills are formed by Christian principles and fortified by divine grace, then we may hope that a new generation of youth will emerge which can happily triumph over the difficulties, bewilderments and fears that presently assail us, and which by its knowledge, virtue and example can establish a better and healthier social order.

It is Our great consolation to know that these Religious Institutes are laboring to that end, guided by those wise rules which their Founders have bequeathed to their respective Institutes as a sacred inheritance. We desire that they perform this task not only with the greatest alertness, diligence

and devotion, but also animated by that supernatural spirit by which human efforts can flourish and bring forth salutary fruits. And specifically We wish that they strive to imbue the youths confided to them with a doctrine that is not only certain and free from all error, but which also takes account of those special arts and processes which the present age has introduced into each of the disciplines.

But what is most important is this, that they draw supernatural strength from their religious life, which they ought most intensively to live, by which they may form to Christian virtue the students committed to their care, as the mission confided to them by the Church demands. For if this virtue were relegated to a subordinate position, or neglected entirely, neither literary nor any other type of human knowledge would be able to establish their lives in rectitude. In fact, these merely human attainments can become effective instruments of evil and unhappiness, especially at that age "which is as wax, so easily can it be fashioned to evil" (*Horace, de Arte Poetica*, 163).

Therefore, let them watch over the minds and souls of their pupils; let them have a profound understanding of youthful indifference, of its hidden motivations, of its deep-seated drives, of its inner unrest and distress, and let them wisely guide them. Let them act with vigor to drive away at once and with the utmost determination those false principles which are a threat to virtue, to avert every danger that can tarnish the brightness of their souls, and to so order all things about them that while the mind is being illumined by truth, the will may be rightly and courageously controlled and moved to embrace all that is good.

DIVINE AID

While these Religious Brothers know that the education of youth is the art of arts and the science of sciences (St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat. II*, *Migne P. G. XXXV*, 426), they know, too, that they can do all these things with the divine aid, for which they pray, mindful of the word of the Apostle of the Gentiles: "I can do all things in Him who strengtheneth me" (Phil. IV, 13). Therefore, let them cultivate their own piety as much as they can, as is only right for those who, although not called to the religious priesthood, yet have been admitted to the lay form of the Religious Life (Canon 488, 4). Such a Religious Institute, although composed almost entirely of those who by God's special calling have renounced the dignity of the priesthood and the consolations that flow therefrom, is all the same held in high honor by the Church, and is of the greatest assistance to the sacred ministry by the Christian formation of youth.

On a previous occasion we turned our attention to this subject, saying: "The Religious State is in no sense reserved to either the one or the other of the two types which by divine right exist in the Church, since not only the clergy but likewise the laity can be Religious" (Allocution to the Meeting of Religious Orders . . . held at Rome; A. A. S. 1951, p. 28). And by the very fact that the Church has endowed laymen with this dignity and status, it is quite plainly signified to all that each part of this holy militia

can labor, and very effectively, both for its own salvation and that of others, according to the special canonical rules and norms by which each is regulated.

Wherefore, let no one lack esteem for the members of these Institutes because they do not embrace the priesthood, or think that their apostolate is less fruitful. Moreover, it is a fact well known to Us that they gladly encourage the youths committed to their care for instruction and education to embrace the priesthood, when it seems that divine grace is calling them. Nor is there any lack of instances of their former pupils who now adorn the ranks of the episcopate and even the Sacred College of Cardinals. These Religious Institutes merit and deserve Our praise and that of the whole Church; they deserve, also, the good-will of the bishops and the clergy, since they give them their fullest support, not only in providing a fitting education for youth, but also in cultivating the vocations of those students whom divine grace attracts to the sacred priesthood.

Therefore, let them hold to the way upon which they have entered, their vigor increasing day by day; and one with the other religious Orders and Congregations to whom this work has been confided, let them devote themselves to the instruction and education of youth with peaceful and willing souls.

As a pledge of the divine help, which we implore for them with earnest prayer, and as a testimony of Our personal benevolence, we lovingly impart the Apostolic Blessing to you, Our Beloved Son, and to each of the Superiors of these Institutes, to their subjects and to their pupils.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's on the 31st day of the month of March, of the year 1954, the sixteenth year of Our Pontificate.



Why Girls Leave the Convent

Yes, girls do leave the convent as the newspapers have said. But it is not always for reasons of "health." The doors of the convent are not scenes of great weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, going in either direction. When a girl passes through them going in, her eyes are clear and bright, searching for the answer to the question of how she is to live her love of God. If she leaves through the same doors, her eyes are equally as clear and bright. Perhaps a little brighter now that she has lived with God and knows the beauty of His house. And brighter, too, with a vision that she has not been rejected but rather redirected. Now she knows that He loves her and is interested in her wherever she may go and whatever she may do. Whether she goes or whether she stays, she has found her vocation.—*SUPERIOR CALIFORNIA CATHOLIC HERALD, August 5, 1954.*

European TV Network

POPE PIUS XII

Five-language telecast by the Holy Father on June 6, 1954, heard and seen by TV viewers in Italy, Switzerland, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Denmark and Great Britain.

(Translated from the Italian)

IS IT, perhaps, not a fortunate coincidence that today, when the Church solemnly commemorates the descent of the Holy Spirit into the Cenacle and the first preaching of the Apostle Peter to the multitudes eager for truth and peace, We are enabled to address you personally, European viewers of television, and to tell you how great is Our joy in meeting you, in this manner, in the intimacy of your homes?

A happy outcome thus crowns today the long efforts, the arduous research, the countless experiments by individual scientists, as well as by groups of scholars and nations, to establish a new means of intellectual and artistic exchange among European peoples and perhaps later with other continents.

Undoubtedly, it had already been possible by means of radio to bring into your homes words of teaching, encouragement or comfort. However, who is not eager for instant contact? No matter how fervent and effective a speech may seem, it becomes all the more vivid and stirring when nearness to the speaker makes it possible to catch on his countenance the subtlest nuances of the most delicate sentiments and to imprint his features upon one's mind.

Thus We are happy to greet the noble undertaking of the "Union Européenne de Radiodiffusion," thanks to which, with the cooperation of organizations responsible for television and the persevering work of technicians who have charge of the good functioning of transmitting and receiver stations, it has become possible for this European network of picture transmission to come into being.

Experiments carried out successfully in past years across the English Channel have made it possible to work out the program which is started today and which is the first transmitted by Italian television to the nine European television networks within the framework of the first international television exchange.

(Translated from the French)

The functioning of a European television network, moreover, fulfills the desires of both technicians and spectators. As every recent invention, television is eager to explore its special potentialities. It has discovered that its most favorable type of activity is to seize upon the most interesting mani-

festations of human life at the very moment they occur. Whether it is a matter of scientific, artistic or sports activities, of the innumerable aspects of modern technology or social achievements, everyone nowadays wants not only to be informed about them with the shortest possible delay, but also to take part in them and, if possible, to witness them.

The difficulty of producing a program of high quality invited a cooperation that would divide costs while at the same time it enlarged the field of direct investigation. It is important to remark, in fact, that if the television camera captures reality in a synthetic manner, it nevertheless submits it to a more minute analysis than objective cinematography: because of the reduced dimensions of the receiving screen, it prefers close-up pictures of only a few persons, whose most fleeting expressions it captures. No hesitations by interpreters escape it and the concentrated attention of the spectator, which is not influenced by the atmosphere of a closely-packed audience, pardons neither the eventual weakness of the subject nor failures of presentation.

Television can, therefore, cast a curious glance everywhere and introduce itself into the heart of events. It is, then, a privileged instrument of human exploration, an effective means of putting men in contact with one another and of revealing to them most quickly, surely and with an unsuspected power of penetration the innumerable forms of contemporary life.

(Translated from the German)

However, as soon as the far-reaching importance of this instrument for distributing information and knowledge becomes evident, another delicate problem immediately comes to the fore: what about the moral value of this partially new world opened up by television in a far more comprehensive and attractive manner than by radio and film? Is it not possible that together with the very best there may be found other things injurious to the moral sense? Consequently, should it not be the primary and self-evident duty of the television companies and the spectators to provide for prudent and fitting selection?

There are already too many open wounds in the body of today's society—wounds inflicted by the corruptive activities of a certain type of press, film and radio. Will, perhaps, the evil only be worsened by this new, even more effective, medium, or will there be a readiness from the very beginning to create something really constructive and genuinely wholesome?

In an effort to find the necessary market, producers are often tempted to distribute entertainment material catering to baser human instincts. It is not sufficient to deplore the consequences of such an evil—particularly the selfish, drunken craving for worldly pleasures, together with the hard-heartedness toward the distress and desires of fellow men. Suitable preventive measures are necessary.

If television wishes to keep its brilliant promises, it ought to take care not to use those cheap tricks that are as much contradictory to good taste as to the moral sense. It ought to refrain from dealing with the unnatural products of a diseased spirit of our times. Television should rather endeavor

to give recognition to genuine beauty and to all those wholesome, lofty and superior things that have been, and continue to be, created by the culture of mankind and, particularly, by the Christian religion.

(Spoken by the Pope in English)

Perhaps one might here call special attention to the desire of a television audience to see reflected on the screen some of its own deepest aspirations, its ideal of human brotherhood, of justice and of peace, its love of family and country, and also the fact that it is a part of a society whose purpose transcends the limits of this material world, or belongs to a religious group. We are thinking in particular of those of you whom sickness or infirmity confines to your homes and who would like to find the consolation and comfort they need more than others by being present in spirit at religious ceremonies and uniting their prayer to that of the Church. From now on television, better than radio, will bring them into the sanctuary. This will not, of course, take the place of being present actually and in person at religious rites; but at least it will help to create the atmosphere of reverence and recollection that surrounds liturgical functions, and bring the audience to share the fervent prayer of faith and adoration that rises heavenward from a gathering of the faithful.

May this first international program, bringing together eight countries of Western Europe, be at once a symbol and a promise! Symbol it is of union between the nations and in one respect, to a degree, it initiates that union. For must not knowledge go before appreciation and esteem? Let the European nations then learn to know each other better; let them be happy and proud to display the national beauties of their countries and its cultural riches; let them open to others the deeper feelings of their spirit and their sincere desire for understanding and cooperation. How many prejudices, how many barriers will thus fall! Lack of mutual confidence, selfishness will lessen, and above all a renewed ambition will be stirred to contribute something to the world community for the common good. Such is Our hope.

On this day of Pentecost may the Divine Spirit, sent to enlighten the minds of men on this earth and to inflame their hearts with love of the Supreme Good, find in this product of human toil an instrument to extend the reign of mutual understanding and concord among all peoples. With an earnest prayer for this gift precious beyond others, and from a heart filled with love for all, We impart the Apostolic Blessing.

(Translated from Dutch)

In conclusion, We greet all Dutch-speaking spectators and with them the entire Netherlands nation, whose welfare is close to Our heart and whose future We follow with warm interest. Beloved sons and daughters, from Our heart We pray God for His bountiful blessings upon you.

Television in Italy

POPE PIUS XII

Exhortation to the Italian Episcopate issued January 1, 1954.

THE rapid progress which television has already made in many countries draws Our attention more and more to this marvelous instrument which science and technology offer humanity, destined as it is to have a profound influence for good or evil on public and private life.

In Italy, too, television is about to inaugurate regular transmissions. The project already in hand of a vast network of stations throughout the whole country foreshadows a remarkable development of this new and potent means of expression and diffusion of images, ideas, thought, and of art.

No one can fail to recognize the importance of this event. It puts before the public a whole new series of delicate and urgent problems of conscience, the necessity for active vigilance and for organization in this field, too.

It is a great comfort to Us, Venerable Brothers, to know that you share Our preoccupations in this regard, and We thank you sincerely for it. Convincing, therefore, of the gravity of the matter, We think the moment has come to address you concerning it, to exhort you to persevere in your praiseworthy efforts and in order that your combined action, appropriately directed by the norms which We intend to give, may be timely and efficacious in its effect and bear lasting and salutary fruit.

Let Us fully acknowledge the worth of this splendid conquest of science, for it is another manifestation of the admirable greatness of God, "which He reveals to man in order to be honored in His wonderful works" (*Eccl. 38, 6*). So television, too, obliges Us all to gratitude, a duty which the Church never wears of inculcating in her children every day in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, telling them that "it is really worthy and just, right and salutary, always and everywhere to give thanks to God" for His gifts.

Such were Our thoughts when We were able to use this means for the first time at Easter, 1949, to communicate with Our sons, and while Our voice reached them their eyes could meet Our person. Our words even then were: "We hope that television will play an important role in making truth ever clearer to minds sincerely seeking it."

In recent times the cinema, sports, not to mention the dire necessities of daily work, have increasingly tended to keep members of the family away from home, and thus the natural blossoming of domestic life has been upset. We must be glad, then, that television contributes efficaciously to reestablish the balance, by providing the whole family with an opportunity for honest diversion together, away from the dangers of bad company and places.

Neither may We be indifferent to the beneficial consequences which television can have in social matters, in relation to culture, to popular education, to teaching in the school, in the international life of peoples, for it will

certainly help them to a greater mutual knowledge and understanding and promote more cordial feelings and better reciprocal cooperation.

Nevertheless, it is on the part which television will not fail to play in spreading the Gospel message that We wish to dwell especially. In this respect, the consoling results which have accompanied the industry of Catholics in countries where television has existed for some time are known to Us. But who can foresee the nature and magnitude of the new fields opened to the Catholic apostolate, when television stations, established all over the world, will permit a still closer view of the throbbing life of the Church? It is Our earnest hope that the spiritual links which bind the great Christian family will then be drawn still tighter, and that a greater knowledge, a deeper understanding and a wider extension of God's reign on earth may follow the use of this marvelous instrument in diffusing the light of the Gospel message in men's minds.

INHERENT DANGERS

Such considerations, however, should not make one forget another aspect of this delicate and important question. If, indeed, television, when well regulated, can be an effective means of a sound, Christian education, it is also true that it is not free from dangers, because of the abuses and evils to which it can be perverted by human weakness and malice. These dangers are all the more grave as the power of suggestion of this invention is greater, and its audience wider and more indiscriminate.

Different from the theater and the cinema, which limit their plays to those who attend of their own free choice, television is directed especially to family groups, made up of persons of every age, of both sexes, of differing education and moral training. Into that circle it brings the newspaper, the chronicle of events, the drama. Like the radio it can enter at any time, any home and any place, bringing not only sounds and words but the detailed vividness and action of pictures; which makes it more capable of moving the emotions, especially of youth. In addition, television programs are made up in great part of cinema films and stage productions, too few of which, as is known from experience, can fully satisfy the standards of Christian and natural moral law. Finally, it should be noted that television finds its most avid and rapt devotees among children and adolescents who, because of their very youth, are more apt to feel its fascination and, consciously or unconsciously, to translate into real life the phantasms they have absorbed from the lifelike pictures of the screen.

It is easy, therefore, to realize how television is very intimately bound up with the education of youth and even the sanctity of the home.

Now, when We think of the incalculable value of the family, which is the very cell of society, and reflect that within the home must be begun and carried out the physical as well as the spiritual development of the child, the precious hope of the Church and of the nation, We cannot fail to proclaim to all who have any position of responsibility in television that their duties and responsibilities are most grave before God and society.

Public authorities especially have the duty of taking every precaution

that that air of purity and reserve which should pervade the home be in no way offended or disturbed; in this regard even the wisdom of antiquity, moved by religious respect, declared: "Let no improper word or sight cross the threshold of this home . . . for the child one must have the utmost reverence" (*Juvenal, Satires*, XIV, 44, 47).

We have constantly before Our mind the painful spectacle of the power for evil and moral ruin of cinema films. How, then, can We not be horrified at the thought that this poisoned atmosphere of materialism, of frivolity, of hedonism, which too often is found in so many theaters, can by means of television be brought into the very sanctuary of the home? Really, one cannot imagine anything more fatal to the spiritual health of a country than to rehearse before so many innocent souls, even within the family circle, those lurid scenes of forbidden pleasures, passion and evil which can undermine and bring to lasting ruin a formation of purity, goodness and healthy personal and social upbringing.

For these reasons We think it opportune to make the point that the normal vigilance that must be exercised by the authority responsible for public entertainment is not sufficient, in regard to television programs, for securing broadcasts unobjectionable from the moral point of view. In television, where there is question of pictures that will penetrate the sanctuary of the family, a different criterion of judgment is necessary. So one sees the groundlessness, especially in this field, of the pretended rights of absolute freedom of art, or of having recourse to the pretext of freedom of information and of thought, since here higher values are at stake which must be safeguarded; and those who offend against them cannot escape the severe sanctions threatened by the Divine Saviour, "Woe to the world because of scandals . . . woe to the man through whom scandal does come!" (Matt. 18, 7).

HOPES FOR JUDICIOUS NORMS

We cherish the heartfelt hope that the noble sense of responsibility of those who have authority in public life will avail to forestall the deplorable occurrences which We have deprecated above. In fact, We should like to hope that as far as programs of cinema or drama are concerned, judicious norms will be forthcoming, aimed at making television serve as a healthy recreation for people and contribute as well in every way to their education and moral improvement. But that these hoped for measures achieve their full effect, there must be alert and active vigilance on the part of all.

To you, Venerable Brothers, We turn first of all, and to all the clergy, in this connection making Our own the words of St. Paul to Timothy: "I charge thee, in the sight of God and Jesus Christ, who will judge the living and the dead, by his coming and by his kingdom: preach the word, be urgent in season, out of season: reprove, entreat, rebuke with all patience and teaching" (II Tim. 4, 1-2).

But no less urgently do We turn to the laity also, whom We wish to see in ever greater numbers and in closed ranks around their pastors, in this holy crusade, too. In a particular way let those whom the Church, through Catholic Action, calls to work at the side of the hierarchy under-

stand the need for timely action, before it is too late, to make their presence felt in this field. No one has the right to watch passively the rapid developments in television, when he realizes the extremely powerful influence it undoubtedly can exercise on the national life, either in promoting good or in spreading evil.

And in the event of abuses and evils, it is not enough for Catholics to remain content with deplored them; those abuses must be brought to the attention of the public authorities in quite precise and documented particulars. Indeed, it must be admitted that one of the reasons, less noticed perhaps but real nonetheless, for the spread of so much immorality, is not the lack of regulations, but the lack of reaction, or the weakness of reaction, of good people who have not known how to make timely denunciation of violations against the public laws of morality.

INSTRUMENT OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

However, your efforts would still be far from fully satisfying Our desires and Our hopes if they should be restricted simply to forming safeguards against evil and did not result instead in a vigorous accomplishment of good. The goal We wish to point out to you is this, that television not only be morally irreproachable but that it may also become an instrument of Christian education.

In this regard, the wise considerations which Our Predecessor of happy memory, Pius XI, addressed to the motion picture industry are to the point: "Just as the advances in art, science, even in technical perfection and industrial production are true gifts of God, so also they must be directed to the glory of God and the salvation of souls and must contribute in a practical way to the spreading of the kingdom of God on earth, so that, as the Church bids us pray, we may profit by them in such manner as not to lose the eternal good: 'Let us so pass through the good things of the present as not to lose those of eternity'" (Encyclical, *Vigilanti cura*).

PREPARATION OF PROGRAMS

In order to attain this aim, it is easy to understand how important is the preparation of the programs to be televised. Certainly, in a country of such age-old and profound Catholic traditions as is the Italian nation, We have every right to hope that television will reserve a place proportionate to the importance which Catholicism enjoys in the national life.

To this end We know well and praise highly the provisions already made, in the dioceses where there are transmitting stations, for designating one or more laymen or priests whose duty it will be to take an interest in the preparation of programs of a religious character. We hope, however, that this preparation, in order that it may prove more beneficial, may be developed and coordinated on a national scale, directed by a competent central office, which will have the function of giving uniformity to the activity of individuals, of drawing profit from the fruitful experiences in this field in various parts of the world, of gathering together the observations and advice especially of pastors of souls, and which at the same time

may represent in the proper places the voice and even the mind of the Italian episcopate.

With an activity of this kind on the part of the bishops, who interpret the desires of the wholesome part of the nation as well as of the majority of those who use television, it certainly will be easier, in as far as choice of programs is concerned, for those responsible to resist criteria and evaluations not wholly to be recommended, no matter from what quarter they may be suggested. So also projects of a cultural or organizational nature, or of any other kind, promoted in the various localities, could be centered in the office mentioned above. In the vigorous activity of modern life, which receives such a powerful impulse from the spirit of organization, it is necessary to proceed with unity and harmony; especially in this field the union of Catholics constitutes their power.

FORMING A RIGHT CONSCIENCE

At the same time it is more than ever urgently necessary to form in the faithful a right conscience with regard to their Christian duty concerning the use of television: a conscience, namely, that knows how to forewarn against eventual dangers and conforms itself to the judgments of ecclesiastical authority on the morality of televised presentations. In the first place, parents and teachers should be enlightened, so that they may not have to weep, when it is too late, over the spiritual ruins of lost innocence in the souls of their charges. We could not, therefore, praise highly enough, as true apostles of good, all those who according to their capabilities will aid you in this beneficial undertaking.

The work which awaits you, Venerable Brothers—let us not conceal the fact—is vast and arduous. May you be encouraged, however, by the consciousness of fighting for the preservation of Christian morality in the midst of your flocks; and may your efforts be made fruitful by the Immaculate Virgin, to whose maternal protection in a particular way, during this year dedicated to her, We entrust the success of your holy undertaking. And just as the first steps of television here in Rome, as if in favorable omen, contributed toward rendering more solemn the inauguration of the Marian Year, so may its further development help in the succeeding triumphs of Jesus and Mary, rendering more radiant in the souls of all men of good-will "the light that enlightens every man who comes into the world" (*John 1, 9*), and bringing into every home and every place, wherever this instrument penetrates, "all that rings true, all that commands reverence, all that makes for right; all that is pure, all that is lovely." The cause of civilization, of religion and of peace will be benefited thereby, and "the God of peace will be with you" (*Phil. 4, 8-9*).

That Our hopes and Our prayers may find a generous response in the souls of all, to you, Venerable Brothers, to the faithful entrusted to your care, and to the conscientious and discerning men who dedicate their activity to television, with paternal affection We impart the Apostolic Benediction.

Aftermath of Revolution

MOST REV. MARIANO ROSELL ARELLANO

Pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Guatemala City following the successful anti-Communist revolt in Guatemala, July 6, 1954.

THE Peace of God be with you, beloved children in Christ our Lord. May that peace be with you which the world can neither give nor take away. This is my wish to all of you this day, in Christ our Lord.

Moments of anguish never before imagined, cruel sufferings never before seen, a ruthless calvary of the great Guatemalan motherland as never before experienced in our history, have brought mourning to thousands of homes. And this for the sole crime of rejecting the mercenary sellout of Guatemala to international Communism and a systematic Communist de-Christianization. All these things we repeatedly denounced in frequent pastoral letters, sermons and discourses, some of which were misinterpreted or thought to be the fruit of false alarmism. However, the imprisonment, tortures and assassinations of hundreds of workers and farmers—whose number is greatest among the victims, and who were sacrificed in the Moscow tradition and by Moscow henchmen—are evidence, now more than ever, that Communism in Guatemala followed the Soviet pattern of blood, prison, death and desolation.

We lament with indescribable sorrow that those victims sacrificed with the greater cruelty and in the greater numbers were from the working and farming ranks. Thus the Communist myth proclaimed itself a friend of the workers and farmers of Guatemala, yet it did not hesitate to crush them with Soviet

cruelty, with an inconceivable criminality and barbarism. This is the peace that Moscow preached to us: a peace of anguish in the city, while in prisons throughout the Republic the children of the Guatemalan motherland were tortured, harassed and murdered without pity or restraint. Indeed, a peace—a peace of the cemetery, a peace to hide crime, a false peace. For Communism, which is a tree of hate, can never bear the fruits of peace—because peace is the opposite of what Communism is and preaches.

A new legion of martyrs enriches the glory of Guatemala. The blood of her sons from all walks of life, and particularly the laborers and farmers, was the generous and expiatory offering that stopped the bloody Communist monster.

May this innocent and heroic blood of our martyrs against Communism, in the name of God and of the motherland, be the great price of a true peace which we all desire; a peace that must not again be stained by blood, a peace that can come only from the good conscience of God's children, the Guatemalans—the peace of Christ. For, if peace is a supreme good, it can only come from the Supreme Good which is the Lord, our God.

In this hour of vindication against Communism, and with the bloody calvary passed, we all long for this true peace of Christ. We all desire that the evil doctrines which have borne such cruel fruits among us shall never again

return to our land. All of us rejoice now in the happiness of a true peace, with a happiness that increases after weeks of tragedy and suffering throughout the land.

SOCIAL JUSTICE

But this peace which fills us today with a rare happiness could be lost within a few months unless its fundamental basis is social justice and Christian charity. Peace is the fruit of justice.

You have conquered Communism, dear children of Guatemala, casting it out of the land. However, Communism cannot be checked by force of arms indefinitely. Only social justice can root out the seed of Communism, which germinates and grows in an atmosphere of social injustice. Only when the field is not cultivated by the charity of Christ, only in an atmosphere of exploitation of the worker and the farmer, does the criminal seed of Communism take root.

Christian charity and mercy are not the same, as some think. But Christian charity is the love of one's fellow man raised to the maximum: "Love thy neighbor as thyself," loving one another as God loves us. Now is the hour of Christ's peace, the reality of social justice carried to its ultimate fulfillment as the only means to a fruitful and lasting peace. Lasting peace is not that of bayonets, guns, or bullets. Force of arms may dislodge the Communists from a nation, but only social justice, based on Christian charity, can root out Communism from men's hearts; for, paradoxical as it may seem, the ideology of Communism is a greater enemy than the Communists themselves.

In this hour of joy, let us not forget that of the seven heads of the Communist monster, we have cut off only one. And even this head may grow back

again unless we improve the economic conditions of the laborers and farmers. You have not expelled the Communists from Guatemala only to haggle over the rights of workers, nor to deprive them of the natural rights they have for the land they cultivate, nor to strip them of their rightful social gains, such as better working hours, loans and benefits. Quite the contrary. In order to stamp out Communism completely there is still a decisive battle to be fought in Guatemala, a battle for social and distributive justice. The hour has come to give to workers and farmers all those benefits sought by the papal encyclicals of Leo XIII, Pius XI and Pius XII. This is only the beginning of peace. It is urgent that, in the name of Guatemala, we make it a lasting peace founded on Christian social justice.

But social justice is, in turn, based on the essential virtue which is the love of God. And it is of this we speak when we refer to Christian charity, which is not alms, but a love of our fellow men in God without distinction. This kind of love alone can restore that unity which Guatemala lost by international Communism. This love is the divine gift which makes us forgive him who offends us, which prompts us to give to others not only what is rightfully theirs but even more, which makes us live in peace with each other, because we are brothers, children of the same Father, God, our Lord, redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ, who made us co-heirs of His glory. Let us not seek personal vengeance, since there are proper courts to administer justice for crime. Let us not mar this glorious gesture with personal hatreds. Love can accomplish everything, and the realization of a true social justice depends on it alone.

By the essential duty of our pastoral office, we exhort you in the name of

God, beloved children, not to forget that all Guatemalans must conduct themselves as brothers, for we are all children of the same God. Thus will the banner of Catholic social justice be implanted more firmly than ever before as the highest justice that exists on earth. This alone can forestall a return to our land of evil dictatorial regimes that try to impose a slavery upon us such as Communism, which even attempts to deprive us of the knowledge and love of God.

CAUSES OF COMMUNISM

We now try to make clear the factors that bred Communism in our country. We repeat them to you once more, as we have done many other times in our pastorals and discourses. Communism was caused in our country by both the conservative parties, which blocked the development of social justice, and the liberal parties, which undermined the consciences of the people, leading them to place wealth and power above all other values. The latter, furthermore, desiring to remove God from the hearts of the people, took down the image of Christ from the courts of justice and suppressed God's name in the schools. The long and uninterrupted dictatorships, replete with social injustice, were the fruits of more than a half-century of secularism and made the Guatemalan people a ready field for Communist preaching.

Catholics of Guatemala! Let us be rid of these unjust social ideologies of conservatism and liberalism, and let us seek in the papal encyclicals our legitimate ambitions for the social betterment of Guatemala.

Let us be rid of immorality. Strengthen the life of the Catholic home. Let us educate our people in Catholic truths without compromise, and then

the parasite of Communism shall no longer thrive in our country.

The hour of struggle against Communism has not ended. Economic liberalism and conservatism both lead to Communism, for both are devoid of the fundamental Christian sentiment of social and distributive justice. If you desire this victory of yours to be lasting, and desire that the Red banner of the cruelty and mockery of Communism not return to our land, there is only one way—the peace of Christ in the reign of Christ. And this reign is founded on love, whose fruit is justice.

Never forget that Communism promises social vindications with no other purpose but to gain power for itself. After this, it is lavish with lashings, tortures and mass murders, carrying its cruelty to the point of denying Christian burial to the dead.

Your Archbishop pleads with you. Do not satisfy personal vengeances, for these crimes shall, without doubt, be avenged by the Supreme Judge of the living and the dead, from Whom the fugitive of justice cannot hide. Nor can they deceive Him, or be left free to corrupt all the powers of the world. Your Archbishop exhorts you to rebuild the unity of our country, Guatemalan and Catholic throughout. Let us struggle against Communism as both anti-Guatemalan and anti-Catholic. But, in rooting it out, let us not make use of that same social demagoguery of which Communism is a past master. Rather, let us rely upon social justice, in which the social teachings of the Catholic Church are the sole guide.

Our last pastoral letter, "On the Gains of Communism in Guatemala," summoned you to this Catholic crusade of justice and charity. The Church recognizes the rights of the weak, and defends them as part of her own being. Thus the time has come to intensify

even more the practice of the social teachings of the Church. It is now the time to announce to you that, if Guatemala fails to pursue the Christian path of love and justice and gives itself once more to nefarious systems, anti-Christian in spirit—whether they call themselves liberals or conservatives—do not be surprised if, after a few years, we may once more lament these bloody mock trials ("chechas"), mass murders and the loss of our national autonomy.

There is only one path to be followed: social justice and its free enactment without hindrance. To fight for God's rights, which are vigilant of the rights of the weak and the poor, brings about a total uprooting of Communism. On the contrary, the liberal and anti-social conservative doctrines only till fertile ground for Communism, as we have already seen.

Let us seek the kingdom of God and His justice. Let us give our fellow men what is rightfully theirs without haggling. When we do this with love, we

can be sure that there shall have passed permanently the cruel trial which Guatemala has experienced.

From the holy crucifix, the *Cristo de Esquipulas*—which accompanied a pilgrimage of social justice throughout the land to dislodge Communism from the hearts of the people—may there flow out upon Guatemala the balsam that heals all wounds with charity. May we realize the fruits of Catholic social justice, so that never again will the peaceful fields of our country be covered with blood and slaughter, which during these months of the cruel Communist regime were bloodstained as never before.

May there be fulfilled once more, beloved children in Christ, that timeless truth prophesied by the Divine Master. Who said: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself." (*John 12, 32*)

With paternal affection, beloved children, We impart to you the pastoral blessing.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse
With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff
EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.
BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph F. MacFarlane
CIRCULATION MANAGER: Patrick H. Collins
BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.